The Forum

DECEMBER, 1895.

CONDITIONS FOR AMERICAN COMMERCIAL AND FINANCIAL SUPREMACY.

THERE is much surprise in France and throughout the continent of Europe that a nation so great, so rapidly growing, so richly endowed in character and in material resources as is the American people, should allow its development to be trammelled by frequent and severe crises, and that it should either be unable to discern their causes or lack decision to remove them from its path. The European accustomed to the study of financial phenomena is struck by two facts peculiar, at present, to the United States: on the one hand, the issue of an enormous volume of paper money,—redeemable in specie, it is true, by the public Treasury; on the other hand, the hesitation shown by the American people in according legal monetary preëminence to gold, and the dreams of bimetallism, national or international, in which they indulge. On these two points—paper money issued by the state, and the question of silver and bimetallism,—I am about to submit some observations which the American situation suggests to a sympathetic European observer.

I.—STATE ISSUES OF PAPER MONEY.

That a state involved in a great war should issue—directly, or indirectly through the agency of a privileged bank or a syndicate of banks—considerable amounts of paper money, and that it should suspend the payment of this paper in specie, is not an unusual phenomenon; it is in fact a common practice, and even a necessity which can-

Copyright, 1894, by the Forum Publishing Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not be avoided by a people engaged in a struggle of vital importance. If a great war were again to break out in Europe or elsewhere, we should surely see the belligerents, from the moment war was declared, if not before, make large issues of paper money, directly or indirectly; and these would be not for the operations of commerce, but for those occasioned by the war,—the purchase of arms and supplies, and the payment of troops; and their only security would be the pledge of the national faith and national good sense.

As early as the close of the eighteenth century, England, during her prolonged conflict with the French Republic, caused advances to be made by the Bank of England in such amounts that specie payments were suspended in 1797. More recently, at the time of the Franco-German war in 1870, France did the same. The Bank of France advanced to the Treasury enormous sums, exceeding *F.* 1,500,000,000 (approximately $300,000,000), and was forced by these loans, and by operations of a special nature locking up its assets, to suspend specie payments under sanction of law.

Russia, Austria, Italy,—all nations that have had great wars to carry on in the course of the present century,—have been obliged to create resources for themselves in this way by the issue of paper money directly by the state, or indirectly by a bank or a syndicate of banks. There has been only one exception,—Prussia, in her war against Austria in 1866, and in that against France in 1870. This exception was due in part to the fact that Prussia had had the prudence to establish a fund in specie for war purposes,—a fund which, though it would be regarded as very modest at the present time, was of considerable magnitude then; and in part also to the fact that the Prussian victories from the beginning of the war permitted her armies to live, in some degree, on the enemy's country, and enabled the Treasury to make loans on normal terms. It is probable, if a great war should now take place between Germany and any other country, that circumstances would not be so favorable to her, and she would be compelled to take immense advances from the Imperial Bank, and, like France, to resort to legal-tender paper money. Thus the United States, in creating resources by means of paper money in the great war of secession, only did what was done by England in her struggles with the French Republic and Empire; by France herself in 1870–71; by Russia, Austria, Italy, and other countries; and would be done again in the future by any European power entering on a struggle on which its destinies might depend.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Resources thus obtained by issues of paper money have, however, been considered by every well-governed European power only as a provisional expedient, to be abandoned as soon as possible. France and England both, during this century at least, possessing and maintaining a solid monetary circulation, have under such circumstances devoted themselves, immediately on the reëstablishment of peace, to the suppression of the paper money issued to meet war expenditures. By 1819 there was no trace left of this paper money in England. In that year the Bank of England, which had issued it, regained a completely normal condition. The only notes it had outstanding originated in its discounts and other commercial operations, and represented its commercial paper and its specie reserve.

After the disastrous war of 1870–71, France regarded it as the most urgent, if not the chief object of its financial policy, absolutely to repay to the Bank of France the advances made to the government during the war, amounting to *F.* 1,500,000,000, or $300,000,000. One of the greatest services rendered to the country at that time by M. Thiers was the energy with which he insisted that this debt must be paid before all others. Yet it bore interest at only 1 per cent per annum, and at that time the French government was borrowing at 6 per cent on bonds in perpetuity. Nevertheless it was thought, and with reason, that it was far better for the country to discharge this debt at 1 per cent, and to get back to a completely normal monetary circulation. M. Thiers secured an appropriation of *F.* 200,000,000 ($40,000,000) a year for the redemption of this paper. This policy was followed by his successors, and the *F.* 1,500,000,000 lent to the state by the Bank was repaid in successive annual instalments by the month of March, 1879, eight years after peace was declared. At the present moment not a trace of that fearful conflict remains in the French monetary system.

In the United States, after the war of secession, the point of view taken by England after the peace of 1815, and by France after the peace of 1871, was not adopted. Yet the American paper-money issues—greenbacks—had the same origin as the English and French issues, namely, to secure provisional resources for the Treasury in time of war, when it was difficult if not impossible to obtain them immediately and of sufficient amount by public loans. The fact seems to have been overlooked that these greenbacks were a temporary expedient that ought not to be long continued after peace was established. The American government showed a zeal most praiseworthy in itself,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in reducing its bonded debt; but it neglected to redeem its urgent floating debt, as in like circumstances had been done by the English and French governments. It appears, indeed, that at one time the government realized that its paper currency ought to be abandoned. If I mistake not, a law of April, 1866, directed its redemption in monthly instalments. That was the true financial policy, but it was soon abandoned. The belief obtained that the situation would be sufficiently improved and strengthened by the resumption of specie payments in 1879. This, in my judgment, was a great and vital error, the evil influence of which has been, and is yet, seriously felt in the entire monetary and financial situation of the United States. A government is ill-fitted and ill-equipped to maintain paper money in circulation, even if the paper is redeemable in specie. The redemption alone is in itself a great trouble and a continual embarrassment.

A fiduciary currency—that is, paper accepted by the public with confidence, representing specie, and payable in specie on demand—must not be a rigid, uniform currency. It ought to be elastic and variable, following the movements of both domestic and foreign trade. The means constantly required to adapt the fiduciary currency of a country to its changing needs are in part personal, in part material, in their nature. By this I mean that on the one hand the persons who distribute and direct the fiduciary currency must have special and rare qualities,—experience, tact, and nimbleness of mind; and that on the other hand these persons must possess certain powers and methods for regulating the supply and demand of both the fiduciary currency and metallic money.

Now it is apparent that the government and the functionaries who represent the government, and who must act by fixed and always identical rules, have neither the personal nor material means to keep a fiduciary currency flexible, so that it will now contract, now expand, and combine in harmony with specie, especially gold, and so prevent either an excessive and dangerous exportation of gold or its exaggerated and superfluous accumulation. It is only men used to business and banking from early youth, and interested, moreover, in maintaining affairs in a healthy condition, who can have sufficient experience, insight, and decision to take the required steps at the right time for the increase or reduction of the fiduciary currency according to the actual and always changing needs of the country. An immovable rigid fiduciary currency is an absurdity. In the calmest years this currency must vary according to seasons and circumstances. Thus in the year

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1893—the last for which the report is at hand—the circulation of the Bank of France oscillated between a minimum of *F.* 3,255,000,000 ($651,000,000) and a maximum of *F.* 3,589,000,000 ($718,000,000), or a difference of *F.* 334,000,000 ($67,000,000). In somewhat more disturbed years the differences are much more marked. Thus, in 1891, the minimum of the circulation of the Bank of France was *F.* 2,616,000,000 ($523,000,000) and the maximum reached *F.* 3,123,000,000 ($624,000,000)), representing a difference between the highest and the lowest points of about *F.* 507,000,000, or $101,000,000. This capacity to contract or expand can hardly exist in a system of fiduciary currency distributed by the state. It is only professional bankers, constantly mingling in the daily current of the country's business, who can, with competence and tact, acquit themselves of the task of furnishing this substitute for money in the proper proportions, varying as these do from day to day.

The inconvenience of state regulation of fiduciary currency is most striking in connection with the maintenance of the specie reserve. This reserve is absolutely indispensable to any country if it is desired that transactions shall have a solid basis, and contracts for a term of some years shall be possible. In most countries, the banks, either public or private, maintain the specie reserve. Obliged to pay their notes in specie on demand, it is their permanent interest that the specie reserve shall not be exhausted. Moreover they have very effectual means for protecting it. Gold may be required for export to settle debts that have either a commercial or financial source, resulting in the latter case from either public or private loans. Gold must always be furnished for export, otherwise business with other countries will be restricted and at times rendered impossible, and the credit of the country will be impaired. But when gold exports become too extensive, and particularly when they seem caused by a speculative movement, and threaten the metallic reserve of the country, the banks have an excellent means of obviating and removing the evil,—an advance in the rate of discount.

There has been and still is much discussion of the means of protecting specie reserves. In reality there is only one way in which good results may be obtained in this direction. To raise the rate from 2½ or 3 per cent to 4, 5, or even 6 per cent (in former times it has touched 10 per cent in England) is the only rapid and adequate way to protect the specie reserve and prevent excessive exports of gold. At the present day, when the bonds uniting nations in financial and economic matters are much closer than formerly, and the organization

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of international payments is much more flexible and ample, there is no longer any need of a rate so high as 9 or 10 per cent. A few weeks' maintenance of the rate at 6 per cent usually suffices, at least in Europe. From 1880 to 1895, at the time of the *krach* on the Paris Bourse in 1882, and of the downfall of the Barings in 1890, the Bank of England was forced to advance its rate to 6 per cent only three times, and the greatest number of consecutive days for which this rate was maintained was 52,—from the 30th of December, 1889, to the 20th of February, 1890. On the other hand the rate of 5 per cent was reached twelve times in the same period. and was maintained at one time for 127 days consecutively.

An advance in the money rate in order to arrest the out-go of specie, particularly gold, is sure to succeed if the government does not disturb the natural course of operations by artificial measures. Such an advance checks the imports of merchandise, and, on the other hand, stimulates exports. It draws capital from abroad to seek the better returns which are the consequence of this advance. It induces a certain number of the holders of public and other securities to part with them, and influences foreign capitalists to purchase them.

Thus whenever the banks, public or private, are charged with the protection of the metallic reserve of the country, they accomplish it with certainty by this sovereign method of raising the money rate. In a normal condition of international financial relations, this advance may be moderate, and the country experiences only slight detriment, a light and momentary embarrassment, not to be compared to the shock and the discredit resulting from an out-go of gold the end of which cannot be calculated. On the contrary, when the state issues the fiduciary currency, as in the United States, it has no real means of protecting the metallic reserve. It cannot raise the discount rate, for it does not discount commercial paper. It is under obligation to pay gold to all who demand it, without any power to regulate or reduce the demand. It is absolutely disarmed. Its sole resource is to secure specie by loans abroad. But as these loans have no effect on the general current of business, their proceeds are soon exhausted, and they must be renewed. This incapacity to protect its reserve is the chief reason why a state is not fitted to issue fiduciary money.

Let me add that the great banks of one country can easily negotiate temporary loans from the banks of another country. Thus, at the height of the troubles caused by the failure of the Barings, the Bank of England borrowed £3,000,000 in gold from the Bank of France. This

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sum was borrowed for a maximum period of six months, on 3 per cent bonds of the British government. In France there was some criticism of this operation, but the public generally, and all intelligent people, approved it. The Bank of England benefited by it, and so did the Bank of France, since it received interest for several months on *F.* 75,000,000 that it did not need. It is needless to say that the loan was repaid exactly according to its terms. Previously, in the crisis of 1837–39, the Bank of France had lent *F.* 50,000,000 (£2,000,000) to the Bank of England.

Facilities for protecting the metallic reserve are as completely lacking in the state as they are abundant in the banks. Quite out of the daily current of affairs, and incapable of exercising any direct influence upon them, governments are destitute of any means of checking excessive exports of gold. They can do so only by absolute prohibition, which would cause much worse evils than it could prevent.

It seems to be the opinion of Mr. Cleveland and his Cabinet that the government of the United States should cease to issue and distribute fiduciary money. It should remit this task to the banks. The transition would be easy in the present state of American credit. The question whether it would be better to create a public bank on the model of the Bank of England and the Bank of France, or to resort to a syndicate of banks complying with certain conditions, would take too much space now to examine. Either solution, however, is practicable.

II.—Bimetallism.

The hesitation shown by so rich a country as the United States to adopt the single gold standard and reduce silver to the rank of subordinate or subsidiary coin is most surprising to Europeans. It is true that the United States are among the largest producers of silver. In 1892, according to the Report of the Director of the Mint for 1893 (p. 55), they produced 58,000,000 ounces of this metal, of a "coining value" of $74,995,442, and a market value which to-day is less by one-half than the coining value. Compared with other industries, the silver-mining industry of the United States, according to these official figures, is but a trifling affair. Thirty-seven and a half millions of dollars, market value, and double that at coining value,—what are these sums compared to the immense products of every sort of the United States? Less than ½ per cent of the total product if we take the market

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

value; less than 1 per cent even if we take the coinage value. And to give an artificial value to such an insignificant portion of its immense product, the United States would compromise all the rest! That appears manifestly unreasonable.

It is to be noted, moreover, that should the entire civilized world adopt the single gold standard, the production of silver would not be suppressed nor its price reduced much below what it is to-day. When it shall be abandoned to its natural destiny, and there shall be no more talk of international monetary conferences, or of legal measures to "rehabilitate" it, it is probable that silver will settle down to a price that will still make its production remunerative. To-day silver is worth about 30 pence per ounce instead of the 61 pence which is its fictitious "coining value." If all civilized nations should adopt the single gold standard, and reduce silver to the position of subsidiary money, its price would probably fix itself between 25 pence and 28 pence per ounce, and, this level once reached, it would be nearly stable. The development of the uses of silver in the arts, its use as money in the extreme Orient and in parts of Africa, will suffice to maintain an important outlet for it.

Thus the interest of the United States as a producer of silver is wholly secondary in comparison with the immense advantage the country would have in the possession of a solid metallic currency resting on the metal adopted by the chief civilized countries, and which, by its great value and small volume, is alone suited to the uses of a rich people.

Placed between Europe and Asia, the United States can aspire to take from England, in the course of the next century, the commercial and financial supremacy heretofore enjoyed by that country. For this triumph it will not suffice to possess in abundance coal, iron, cotton, intelligent workmen, and bold and enterprising employers; it will require equally, perhaps indispensably, a monetary system that is definite, rational, and unchangeable. It is beyond dispute that the uninterrupted *régime* of the single gold standard in England since the beginning of the century; the certainty that gold can always be procured in London; the security and precision resulting for every bill of exchange on London and for all British engagements,—all these conditions flowing from the monetary system of Great Britain have contributed in a marked degree to assure to that country its financial hegemony. At the present moment throughout Europe, and even in France, prudent people try to have a part of their fortune in pounds

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sterling, because it is known that pounds sterling are the only true money, that is to say, money that is not exposed to change by new legal arrangements. It is not known exactly what the dollar will be, or the mark, or even the franc. The whims of legislators may change them in the future, as they have changed them in the past. On the contrary there is a rooted confidence among men engaged in finance the world over, that the pound sterling will always be a piece of gold of 7 grammes and 988 milligrammes, 916.66 fine, and that England will never commit the blunder of putting gold and silver on the same footing as money. Thus the pound sterling, all the world through, especially when long contracts are to be made, is not only the money *par excellence;* it is the *only* money, and in it alone can be placed almost absolute confidence.

If the United States are to attain a commercial, and still more a financial position, equal to that of England, the dollar must be given the qualities of the pound sterling; that is, there must be no sort of doubt that it is a gold dollar, and that never for any reason or under any pretext that which is called a dollar shall be paid in silver. Then all nations will have the same faith in the dollar that they have in the pound sterling. As the United States have a territory infinitely more vast than that of England, a territory full of the most varied resources and in which capital can find great opportunities of profit, that country will become the chosen land for the capital of the whole world. The old nations, with narrow territory already almost completely in use, such as (besides Great Britain) France, Belgium, Switzerland, and recently Germany,—all these strenuous producers of savings that they no longer know how to employ will direct their overflowing capital toward the United States. All that is lacking is a completely solid monetary system to enable the American people to profit by a large part of the capital accumulated in such enormous quantities by the old nations of Europe.

We need not here pause to consider the argument so often advanced —although it has never been demonstrated—that the fall in prices for the last quarter of a century is due to the proscription of silver by the monetary legislation of the principal European nations. The fall in prices had one, or rather two, manifest causes, the considerable increase in the production of most commodities, and the progress in industrial methods and in the application of science to this production. That is the real cause of the decline in prices, and it is chimerical to hope to raise them artificially. On the contrary, efforts must be made

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to extend markets, by removing obstacles that disturb relations and exchanges between nations, and to prevent combinations extending over long periods. One of these obstacles is the uncertainty in monetary matters kept up by the partisans of what they call the "rehabilitation" of silver. New international monetary conferences may be called together, but it may be safely predicted that after lengthy discussion concerning the fall in the price of silver, and the evils, real or imaginary, that have resulted from it, they will adjourn without reaching any conclusion.

Every reflecting mind must see that the bimetallist agitation has less chance of accomplishing anything to-day than it had four years, or ten or fifteen years ago. In the first place, most of the great countries have accustomed themselves to the single gold standard, established either by law or by practice. For more than twenty years this system has been applied in Germany, and for almost twenty years (since 1876) in France, Belgium, and Switzerland. All these countries are naturally far less disposed to-day, than they were at the beginning of the fall in silver, to take artificial measures to raise the price of that metal. To-day a fixed ratio between gold and silver, and equality in monetary function between the two metals, is an arrangement long since vanished. It seems an antiquated institution, abandoned for a quarter of a century. Any restoration becomes more difficult with the passage of time. Such is the fate of silver,—a dethroned monarch. In 1876, in 1880, in 1885, even in 1890—though far less at the later dates—there were people disposed to maintain it in its former functions, or to restore those functions when they had been only recently lost. But to-day an entire new generation of adults has arisen who never knew silver in complete possession of the functions of money.

The difficulties in the way of the restoration of silver are infinitely greater than they were twenty years, or ten years, or five years since. In 1876 silver had lost only about 12 per cent of the monetary value accorded to it by the Latin Union. To many minds it appeared not impossible to overcome this disparity, and yet at that time there was not among the European powers a single serious advocate of silver. It was the same in 1878 and 1880, when silver had lost 14 to 15 per cent; and the same again in 1886 and 1887, when the loss had reached 25 per cent. To-day, when it exceeds 50 per cent, the difficulties would be twice, thrice, four times, or ten times greater than at the earlier dates. If no understanding could then be reached, how can any arrangement be possible now?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A third circumstance that must render futile all attempts at an international monetary conference is the failure of the efforts made by the United States through the Bland and Sherman Acts. If the laws of February 28, 1878, and July 14, 1890, despite all the sacrifices imposed on themselves by the American people, succeeded only in increasing the monetary disturbance, it will be understood why European nations have become more and more sceptical as to the influence that international legislation could have in this matter.

There is not a single European country, in a normal financial condition, that attaches the slightest importance to bimetallism. From time to time some Minister utters in Parliament a few equivocal words on the subject, seeking to avoid stripping the bimetallists absolutely of all hope. But America must not be duped by these ambiguous expressions. At bottom, not a country, not a government of Europe has the least wish to make the least change in the established monetary system,—that is, in the preëminence of gold, and the secondary and circumscribed function of silver. If from time to time the bimetallists obtain some vague Ministerial promises to study the monetary problem, it is due to the habit, common to all European statesmen, of avoiding offending or definitely estranging any group of voters, even one of slight importance.

Let us briefly consider each of the principal nations of Europe in succession. Germany made remarkable sacrifices, after the war of 1870–71, to establish the single gold standard. For a long time the opinion of men of affairs in Germany, particularly the merchants of Hamburg, had urged this solution; but the means to execute it were wanting. Germany was not at that time a rich country. To-day the industrial and commercial development of Germany has become widely extended, and she is not going to lose all the fruits of the reform of 1873. A commission may be named to keep the agrarians patient,—the rustic Prussians who dream that the double standard will raise the price of their products and lighten the burden of their debts; the Emperor may call for reports on the question. But we may be sure that Germany, justly proud of having established the gold standard, having gone to heavy expense for that object and derived from it large advantages, will not give up the firm monetary situation, the establishment of which was coincident with the restoration of the German Empire and the development of German commerce.

It is the same with Austria-Hungary. That empire also has greatly increased in wealth in late years. She has made the readjustment of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

her currency on the basis of the single gold standard the chief aim of her financial policy. To this end she has accumulated many millions of francs in gold, and is on the point of completing this great reform. She is not going suddenly to abandon it and fall back into the trammels of the double standard.

I shall say nothing of Russia, with her traditional fondness for withdrawing within herself and avoiding all international engagements. Her financial situation also is much improved. At an early day, especially with the enormous increase in the world's gold product, it will be easy for her, if she wishes, to resume specie payments on the basis of the single gold standard.

As for England, we know the very decided declaration of Sir William Harcourt, the Liberal Chancellor of the Exchequer, as to the impossibility of England's making the slightest change in her monetary system, one of the chief elements of her power. No one takes seriously the remarks of Mr. Balfour on the subject of bimetallism. The member for Manchester, now a Minister, is known to every one as a man full of fantasies, whom neither paradox nor change of opinion dismays.

It would be a mistake to count on France for official support of the bimetallic movement. There has, indeed, during the last two years, been a certain agitation by the agricultural associations for the "rehabilitation" of silver. But this agitation is quite superficial. The body of the public is absolutely ignorant of the very meaning of the words "monometallism" and "bimetallism," "single standard" and "double standard." The financiers and the capitalists—that is to say, the only persons competent to express an opinion—are almost unanimously for the single gold standard. There may be cited, it is true, the name of M. Magnin, the Governor of the Bank of France, who has accepted the honorary presidency of a bimetallist committee. But this is an individual exception. The Governor of the Bank of France is not named by the Directors of the Company, or, as they are termed here, *les régents*. He is a politician who owes his place to the government, and has, as a matter of fact, very limited influence. The most important members of the *Conseil de Régence* of the Bank of France are very decidedly in favor of the single gold standard. Bimetallism in France has lost nearly all its adherents of note. Thus M. Léon Say, a former Minister of Finance and a distinguished economist, who ten or twelve years ago was inclined to be a partisan of the double standard, has recently published in the "Journal des Débats" three very strong articles against bimetallism. All that can be expected from France in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such a matter is a passive attitude; but it would be a mistake to suppose that she will press the "rehabilitation" of silver.

Moreover, within the last two or three years, the partisans of the double standard in every country have lost their principal argument. This was based on the reduction in the production of gold since 1870. Production, indeed, had been colossal from 1850 to 1870, after the discovery of the placers of California and Australia, reaching an average in that period of *F.* 670,000,000 ($134,000,000). After that period, commencing with 1871, it had gradually fallen to about *F.* 500,000,000 ($100,000,000) in the years from 1881 to 1884. This considerable decrease in the production of gold, coinciding with the proscription of silver in various European countries, furnished the bimetallists with their principal weapon. All the pamphlets of MM. Cernuschi and Émile de Laveleye, the great European champions of silver, were filled with considerations as to the gradual diminution of the gold product, the struggle for gold, the appreciation or increased value of gold, the money famine that was already manifesting itself and must become more and more apparent. These gentlemen were clearly lacking in the critical spirit; had they possessed a grain of it, they would have taken note of the remark I made ten years since, that the colonizing movement in Africa and Asia, and, it must be added, in America and in Oceanica, must have brought and must continue to bring to light considerable auriferous wealth.

The lamentations of MM. Cernuschi and Laveleye, and numerous others less known, did, however, make some impression upon numerous people. Certain statisticians admitted—erroneously, I think—an appreciation of gold, and in part attributed to it the fall in prices. Even Mr. Giffen, the zealous statistician of the British Board of Trade, adopted this opinion to a certain extent. To-day it has lost all value. The event, confirming my predictions, which, however, were easily framed, has shown that the colonization of little-explored countries leads to the discovery of very productive gold mines. Since 1888 the production of gold has advanced considerably. In 1894 it exceeded *F.* 800,000,000 ($160,000,000) in place of the average product of *F.* 500,000,000 ($100,000,000) from 1881 to 1883. This production leaves far behind the average of the great auriferous period of 1850 to 1870. A new age of gold is opening, which will strikingly eclipse that which followed the Californian and Australian discoveries about 1850. The production of gold is increasing in all countries,—in the United States, Australia, and Russia; and it tends to become prodigious in South

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Africa. An able English banker of high repute, Sir Edgar Vincent, returned a few weeks since from the Transvaal, and gave it as his opinion that that country contained *F.* 25,000,000,000 ($5,000,000,000) in gold, to be extracted in twenty years. In 1895 the product of the Transvaal alone will probably reach *F.* 250,000,000 ($50,000,000), and will probably reach *F.* 500,000,000 ($100,000,000) in four or five years, if not sooner. In a few years South Africa will produce as much gold as was produced in the entire world in 1883 or 1884. In the meanwhile the old auriferous countries, very far from being exhausted, are augmenting their production and revealing new deposits to prospectors. It is probable that Siberia will in its turn come upon the scene as a great gold-bearing country, when the trans-Siberian railway shall have been completed, as it will be in a few years.

If we reflect that from 1492 (the year of the discovery of America) to 1893,—four centuries,—the production of gold, according to the most trustworthy statistics, was only *F.* 43,000,000,000 ($8,600,000,000), and that the Transvaal alone is presumed to be capable of producing in twenty years *F.* 25,000,000,000 ($5,000,000,000), we shall understand how little question there can be—by the end of this century or the first quarter of the next, at the farthest—of the scarcity of gold, of the scramble for gold, of the appreciation of gold, and all the other formulæ that swarmed as scarecrows through the writings of the bimetallists from 1880 to about 1890. The situation is completely reversed. Within two or three years the world will yield more than *F.* 1,000,000,000 in gold, probably even *F.* 1,200,000,000 ($200,000,000 to $240,000,000) annually, and this will continue for twenty-five or thirty years, if not for fifty or more. Under these conditions it may rather be feared that gold will become too abundant, and may in turn depreciate. Already numerous economists and statisticians foresee a new period of recovery and advance in prices. Their expectations may be premature, but it cannot be denied that they have some foundation.

For my part I do not look for a very decided advance in prices, because all agricultural, industrial, and scientific progress tends to render commodities generally more abundant, less costly, and more freely offered, and because, on the other hand, the rate of the increase of population tends to fall away in most countries. But I believe, if not in a rise in prices, at least in a return of steadiness in them. I am also of opinion that the enormous quantities of gold likely to be produced within a relatively short time may be absorbed without excessive disturbance by the civilized nations, especially if Russia, as is possible,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wishes to resume specie payments on the basis of the gold standard; and if South America, becoming better governed and more prosperous, and following the example of Chili, desires to make the gold standard the sole basis of its monetary system. In any case the bimetallists for the next quarter of a century will be deprived of their chief argument of former times,—the one they regarded as decisive,—the scarcity of gold. A too great abundance of this metal is rather to be feared. Not that there is any fear that gold, in relation to the mass of other commodities, will ever fall as silver has fallen. Although the latter has declined one half in price within twenty-five years, its production has not ceased to advance, and has, even during 1894, been remunerative. It would not be the same with gold. This metal is now very abundant in new countries, but its production is costly. In the Transvaal, which is so much talked of, few mines yield a net profit of more than 30 to 35 per cent on the gold extracted. There can hardly be, therefore, a real depreciation of gold, because too great a fall in its value in relation to the mass of other commodities, and particularly human labor, would stop the working of a great number of mines. The increase in the production of gold since 1888, and especially since 1893, and the probability of a still greater increase within the next ten years, must blast the hopes of the bimetallists. If the production of one metal only—the one most convenient for use as money, most sought in the arts, the only one at present employed in international payments—shall amply suffice for all the needs of the civilized world, why should there be joined with it a less convenient metal, more despised in the arts, and to the use of which modern custom is opposed? The bimetallic movement must be regarded as bound to collapse and vanish.

In these conditions there is but one course worthy of a great nation like the United States. It is not to persist in trying to "rehabilitate" silver; it is definitely to recognize the preëminence of gold and to make of this metal the sole keystone of the American monetary system. Silver will never be anything but subsidiary money for the Western nations. The United States Treasury will, without doubt, lose a part of the sums it has so imprudently sunk in the purchase of silver. But this loss is unimportant for so rich and progressive a people; it is of no consequence compared with the solidity the gold standard will give to the American monetary system and to American credit.

So soon as the capitalists, small and great, of Europe, shall know that the United States have definitely adopted the gold standard and relegated silver to a subordinate monetary rôle, the savings of Western

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Europe will flow toward that country. Freed from the fear that he may some day be repaid in depreciated money, every person with savings in all Europe will be happy to find a return of 3½ to 4 per cent in good American securities, and of 5 to 5½ per cent in the shares of well-established American enterprises. Then the immense territory of the United States will find its vast resources rapidly and completely put in the way of exploitation. The abandonment of notes or paper money issued by the state; the definitive adoption of gold as the sole standard, —these are the two necessary conditions on which the United States can secure a financial position as important as that they now hold in agriculture and in industry. On these two conditions they can some day approach and equal Great Britain as a financial power. If, on the contrary, they persist in their system of government paper money and in the "rehabilitation" of silver, their industrial and commercial development alike will be trammelled, and they will undergo marked and permanent experiences of financial weakness.

PAUL LEROY-BEAULIEU.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NATURE OF LIBERTY.

I.

At a certain period of my life I was witness of such a psychological experience in a whole people as we may sometimes happen to observe in a single person. I lived in Venice during the last years of the Austrian oppression, amidst that mutinous emotion of the Italians which they called the Demonstration. No instances can give a due sense of its intensity, but I may suggest something of its pervasiveness when I say that it touched the whole business and pleasure of life. Prosperity and felicity were measurably postponed to the fulfilment of the yearning for freedom in all classes. With the intelligent this was an aspiration; with the ignorant it was a delirium; with every one it was a passion. The intelligent imagined liberty as unification with free Italy, and expected the fruition of their highest hopes in that event. The ignorant prophesied all good of the glad time when Garibaldi should come.

So far as I could see, the poor were affected very little or not at all by the oppression. They were scarcely in danger of arrest for their political opinions, which they aired freely, at least to any listening foreigner. They could not be annoyed by the sequestration of the liberal newspapers or the prohibition of Italian books, for they mostly could not read; and for the same reason they could not be humiliated by the fact that there was but one journal in Venice, and that this was supervised by the police. They could not be wounded by the censorship which forbade them to publish anything unfriendly to order or favorable to freedom. They were not defrauded when the authorities made the libretto of "I Puritani" read *Gridando lealtà*, instead of *Gridando libertà*, for without money to pay their way into the theatre they could not know whether the chorus shouted for loyalty or for liberty. The spy did not dog their steps; the police did not visit their wretched abodes in midnight perquisition for compromising papers or other proofs of conspiracy. They suffered no hardships from the difficulty of getting a passport into Italy; for they would have had no means of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

using it unless they walked. They were not hampered in business by the vexatious delays of the government in granting leave for novel enterprises; the taxes did not burden them, for they had no property. They might draw a bad number in the conscription, but they would be liable to this misfortune under any government. They had no more incentive to patriotism than the poor have anywhere; but nothing in the Venetian Demonstration was more positive than the attitude of the Venetians who had nothing to gain by it.

I need hardly say that I was in full sympathy with it; for I was young, and I was the commercial representative of a people whose ideal was freedom. I honored the Demonstration with all my heart, and although in my official quality I could not recognize it, I personally shared in it so far as to walk only under the arcades while the Austrian band played in St. Mark's Place; to shun the acquaintance of the military; to keep away from the cafés frequented by officers, and to make a merit of reading books forbidden by the censorship: they did not always repay me for the trouble I took to get them.

All the time I was haunted by a certain misgiving. I felt, in spite of myself, that the Venetians, though they longed for liberty so magnanimously, longed for it without a true sense of its nature, and I began to ask myself certain questions concerning the nature of liberty. I had always believed that it was something political; that this thing which so many had hoped for, lived for, died for, was an affair of annual, biennial, and quadrennial elections; and I was dismayed to find that if I imagined the Venetians in the possession of universal suffrage, under a government of their own creation, I still could not imagine them as happy as they expected to be. I could not even imagine them as free as they expected to be, especially the poorer sort. But I consoled myself with thinking that their error was the error of a people who were not educated to a true knowledge of liberty. By and by, I thought, when they had been free long enough, they would conceive of it aright, and would be satisfied to take it for what it was worth, as I never doubted all the Americans were. They would be content with liberty in its true sense, as we were; and even if they were not content, they would be free, and that was the great thing. They would be able to vote for this one and against that one; to make their own laws, or choose legislators to make them; to speak or print anything they liked; to go and come without asking for a passport; and this would be sufficient, although it was not all they had expected of liberty. It did not then occur to me that the Venetians had a right

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to expect from a free state what they unconsciously and yet really expected: security from want and from the fear of want. If any such notion had been suggested to me I should have laughed it to scorn, but I am not sure now that their formless and tacit expectation was so ridiculous.

II.

We are still deluded with the antique ideal of liberty, which lords it over the imagination in politics, as the antique ideal of beauty lords it over the imagination in æsthetics. This ideal of liberty is the creature of rhetoric very largely; so far as it ever had reality it was the prepotence of a slaveholder who freed himself from tyranny by violence. In his conception, liberty was narrowed to his city or country; it was a Hellenic or a Roman privilege, and not a human right. It was, to be sure, the condition of things unexampled and unexcelled. It gave us literature, sculpture, and architecture still unrivalled; it gave us law which is still the norm of legislation; it gave us a form of society which is the vision of the future state. But the liberty which flowered in the culture of Athens, the legality of Rome, and the socialism of Sparta, was rooted in slavery crueller than the cruellest oppression of any modern despotism. It was the denial of the aspiration for freedom in those whose captivity it rested upon; and as an ideal it has been the fruitful mother of atrocities. Yet still it is in this image that the notion of liberty first presents itself to the mind, just as the thought of beauty first presents itself in the antique ideal. It appears something final, absolute, a good in itself. But liberty is never a good in itself, and is never final; it is a means to something good, and a way to the end which its lovers are really seeking. It is provisionally a blessing, but it is purely provisional; it is self-limited, and is forever merging into some sort of subjection. It no sooner establishes itself than it begins to control itself. The dream of infinite and immutable liberty is the hallucination of the Anarchist, that is, of the Individualist gone mad. The moment liberty in this meaning was achieved, we should have the rule, not of the wisest, not of the best, not even of the most, but of the strongest, and no liberty at all.

So far as we can have any consciousness of it, liberty is merely choice. When a man is not free to choose, he is not free at all. When he is free to choose, he may choose to do wrong, but then he lapses into slavery himself or he enslaves some one else. Where there is mainly a choice of wrong there are no longer rights, there are only advantages.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In its noblest and simplest terms, this liberty which we can feel only as choice, is the power of self-sacrifice. Self-sacrifice can be the act only of those who are free; others may be sacrificed, but these alone can sacrifice themselves.

This self-sacrifice begins with the first step in civility; and it is the end of the savage's self-assertion. The earliest use that the citizen of a liberated state makes of his freedom is to give up some part of it for the common good, to exchange his advantages for rights, to find his own happiness in the well-being of others. It is for this that he pledges his life, his fortune, and his sacred honor. He outlaws himself from an unjust order only that he may inlaw himself with a just order; and he employs that instant of volition which is the whole appreciable existence of liberty, not to secure advantages, but to impart them. Freedom has really no higher function; and it can appear to its possessor only in some moment of evanescence. We are always fancying it something permanent, that can be preserved by a jealous vigilance. But we can enjoy it only in imparting it; we can each of us preserve his own freedom only by guarding the freedom of all; and we must not imagine our state free, so long as there is one oppressed man in it. We are false to our trust and in danger of losing our treasure if we content ourselves even with the greatest good of the greatest number; we must not mean less than the greatest good of the whole number, nor cease to strive for it.

In fine, liberty, whose supreme expression is self-sacrifice, is only another name for choice; the essence of choice is freedom; and in adverse conditions a man has no choice; he does this or he does that because he must, not because he will. But we shut our eyes to the effect of conditions, and expect people to rise above them, to overcome the attraction of gravitation. We say—

> "Honour and shame from no condition rise;
> Act well your part, there all the honour lies."

But no one who thinks can believe this. If a man is in conditions which hinder him from doing what he will, he can no more have honor than he can have shame. The vices of a slave are hateful, but we do not blame the slave for them, and we do not praise him for obedience, meekness, abnegation, which are virtues in the free man. The free man has duties, but the slave has none, and he has no responsibilities. Liberty is not only the power of self-sacrifice: it is the responsibility of self-sacrifice too. If you are free, you are responsible

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for what you do with your gifts, and for their use in behalf of others. But if you are not free, it is your master who is responsible.

III.

As to what empowers you to self-sacrifice, renders you responsible, makes you free, it is commonly supposed to be the citizenship of a free country. But this is very questionable; freedom by no means follows from such a citizenship. In the first place there seem to be as yet no free countries in the world; there seem to be only freer countries; and not every citizen of a freer country is a free man. He is a free man if he has the means of livelihood, and is assured in their possession; if he is independent of others. But if he is dependent upon some other man for the means of earning a livelihood, he is not free. Freedom in fact, which in its highest effect is self-sacrifice, and of the skies, is chained to the earth in the question of necessity, as certainly as the soul is chained to the earth in the body. It is only occasionally a political affair, a civic affair; it is constantly a social affair, a pecuniary affair, an economic affair. It is true that in a tyranny the richest are not free; but in a democracy not only is no man free without the means of livelihood, but the richer man is always freer than the poorer man, as he is in every state.

The failure of most revolts, even such as have permanently displaced an oppression, has been their failure to recognize this fact. If the Venetians had agreed with Garibaldi when he came (he did not come in person, of course), or with Italy when they were united to it, that thenceforward all should be guaranteed the means of livelihood, they would really have all freed themselves. If the French revolution had established these conditions, the first republic would still be one and indivisible. But the Venetians fancied it was enough to drive out the Austrians; the French thought to end all injustice by beheading the aristocrats. Even the Americans believed they had ordained universal freedom when they had thrown off their old allegiance to England, abolished titles, given every one the suffrage, and made their prince elective.

In each case something was gained, but it was not liberty for all. Italy is now a freer country, or at least a freer government, and I do not suppose there are many Italians who would wish back the old despotisms; but probably most Italians under their crushing burden of taxation are now less free than they were under their alien masters. The Venetians during their Demonstration believed that if

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Austrians were driven out the people would be free, just as the French during their revolution believed that if the aristocrats were killed the people would govern. But I fancy none of the gay visions of the Venetians has been quite verified; they have got general progress, but not general prosperity; it is well that the Austrians are away, but the mass of the Venetians are sensibly no freer, have no more freedom of choice, no more power of self-sacrifice, than when the Austrians were in Venice. We believe that a republic is a freer country than a monarchy; certainly a president is less absurd than a king, as a personification of the popular will; and doubtless such liberty as men now have is safer under democratic forms and with an elective chief. At the same time it looks very much as if the great mass of people in every existing state were sacrificed to others without the power to sacrifice themselves.

IV.

We used fondly to figure the American who earned his bread in the sweat of his brow and voted with his party, as a sovereign, and we invited him to regard himself in that light. Really, however, without the means of livelihood in his own hands, but in the hands of another, he is scarcely the regal shape we figured him. The working-man out of a job can have little joy of his vote; and if he is very poor, if he is not making both ends meet, he can hardly will good to others, the sovereign act of the freeman, because he has none to will. It is true that he may rebel, that he may renounce his employment when he has one and does not think himself justly paid; but without the means of livelihood he has no choice except to seek some other employment, and this choice is scarcely freedom. He may, of course, become a tramp, and in the loose play of our circumstances he may not suffer more than many others who remain patiently at work. But then it is our circumstances that befriend him, not our conditions; these are the same for him as the working-man's conditions everywhere. The only moment of sensible or positive political sovereignty for him is that of voting; but in that moment he parts with his sovereignty, for a term of months or years, with respect to the men who shall make his laws, judge them, and execute them. He chooses, he elects, he gives, and—

—"the Gods themselves cannot resume their gifts,"—

—much less a poor devil who has voted with his party and has nothing to eat.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For such a citizen of the freer state, liberty can scarcely be said to exist in the sense that it exists for the more fortunate. He cannot choose, he cannot sacrifice himself for others, for he is already sacrificed; he can impart no advantages, for he has none; and he can have none till he has bettered his fortunes. He remains in the savage necessity of self-assertion, in the warfare which manifests itself in strikes, riots, mutinies, murders. The poor man knows, if the rich man does not know, that the poorer man has always less liberty than the richer man, just as certainly as that he has less money. If he has not the means of livelihood in his own hands, he cannot come and go when he will; he cannot command his time; he cannot choose the kind of work he will do, as the richer man measurably can; he is often enslaved to hateful and loathsome services for others, such as each should do for himself. Till a man is independent he is not free; as long as he must look to the pleasure or the profit of another man for his living he is not independent. His employer may not mean to oppress him: he may be his oppressor very unwillingly, as when his own adversity obliges him to cut down his hireling's wages, but he oppresses him then, however unwillingly, and he oppresses him when he casts him off to seek some other support, not knowing whether he can find it or not. This fact often comes home to the humane employer, especially in the case of hirelings who have served him long and well, and more than any other it tells with the conscience against the whole relation of "hireling and him that hires." The hireling may have all those rights, which are inseparable from the old ideal of liberty, and which we vainly suppose are the proofs of liberty. He may have the right to speak freely, print freely, pray freely, vote freely; but he cannot manfully use his right, though warranted in it by the constitutions and the statutes of all the States, if he is afraid another man may take away his means of livelihood for doing so.

It is needless to say that the personal equation will have much to do with the character of the event. Many—perhaps most—employers are of a make so noble and of a self-respect so fine that they would abhor to interfere with the constitutional rights of their hirelings; and there are hirelings so brave that they would starve, and see their wives and little ones starve, before they yielded their rights. But slavery was none the less an evil because most slaveholders were kind and good people, or because there was now and then a heroic slave. The man who is in danger of want or even in dread of want is not a free man; and the country which does not guard him against this danger and this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dread, or does not assure him the means of livelihood, is not a free country, though it may be the freest of all the freer countries.

In other words liberty and poverty are incompatible; and, if the poverty is extreme, liberty is impossible to it. We pretend otherwise, such of us as are not so directly oppressed by the conditions; but those who feel the burden know better. From time to time they express their dissent in their uncomfortable way, but, tacitly or explicitly, they always dissent from our optimistic pretence. It is possible that the American who earns his bread in the sweat of his brow and votes with his party has known all along that he was not the sort of sovereign we fancied him.

V.

The violent unrest which we call labor troubles is nothing more nor less than an endeavor for the liberty which the working classes think they see the employing classes possessed of. It seems to be a question of more wages with them, and primarily it is a question of more wages, but ultimately it is a question of more power, more ease, more freedom. It is a question of business, of the means of livelihood; and how to secure every man in the means of livelihood, and so guarantee equal freedom to all, is the great problem for statesmanship to solve. It has been supposed hitherto by the comfortable sentimentalists that every man would secure himself in them; but the inefficiency of the individual in this direction has been shown so widely that the problem remains; and it is still, as it always has been, the instinctive expectation of the working-man everywhere that society would yet somehow warrant him the means of earning a livelihood, and so constitute him for the first time a free man.

His expectation seems more or less absurd to his employers, for they have come to believe themselves the only fit repositories of his means of earning a livelihood. But his expectation is deeply grounded in human nature, and more than once in history it has found pathetic expression. We need not go far back for instances. When the serfs were liberated in Russia they expected that the land would belong to them because they alone had worked the land. In fact, Stepniak tells us that the landowners themselves would scarcely have felt wronged if they had been expropriated from the acres they had never touched in behalf of the peasants who had tilled them. At the end of our own war, when the slave's dream of freedom came true, he believed that the gift of liberty would be followed with the gift of forty acres and a mule

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to every head of a family. When his fond delusion became known to the nation which had broken the chains of the oppressed and bidden them go free and see what they could do to keep from starving, a roar of derision went up from all the millions of American humorists. We thought it much less comical to give our acres, not by forties but by millions, to certain railroad companies. Now that turns out to have been a great joke, too, and we are laughing again, but on the wrong side of our mouths.

In the meantime the fact remains that liberty is for those who have the means of livelihood. With them, however, it is always in danger of ceasing to be liberty and of becoming tyranny. In view of this danger some say that those things which are essential to liberty cannot safely be trusted in private hands; for the individual may use them not only to assure himself of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, but he may use them to jeopardize another in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These philosophers have imagined that all should own the means which form the opportunity and safety of each, and so far no one else has imagined any other way out of the trouble, though few are ready to take this way.

VI.

Opportunity is one phase of liberty, safety is another. The safe man is the only free man; and it is not enough not to be in danger, one must not be in fear of danger. Want and the dread of want are the same in moral effect; and when we have liberty in the form of opportunity we must have it in the form of safety, or we have it not at all. If we wished to keep liberty simply as opportunity, we should lose it, for there is nothing vital, nothing lasting in opportunity. We can enjoy liberty only in its ultimate form of safety, and we can not any one of us, or any part of us, be safe, unless all the rest are safe, for the insecurity of others is the perpetual menace of our own security. We must somehow be equals in opportunity and in safety or we cannot be free.

This equality is the logic of liberty, and liberty cannot stop short of it without ceasing to be. It can confer no lasting good, no final blessing, until it has been exchanged for such equality; and to effect this exchange is the supreme office of liberty, as self-sacrifice is its supreme manifestation.

W. D. Howells.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THOMAS BRACKETT REED AND THE FIFTY-FIRST CONGRESS.

WHEN the Fifty-first Congress began its existence in December, 1889, the Republicans, for the first time since 1883, had a small majority in the Lower House, and they proceeded to organize by the election of the Hon. Thomas Brackett Reed of Maine as Speaker.

Like every other legislative body that has ever existed the Fifty-first Congress made occasional mistakes, and Mr. Reed and its other leaders are wise enough to have profited thereby, so that their mistakes will not be repeated; but the work of that Congress, taken as a whole, was better done and was better worth doing than has been the case with any other Congress since the troubled times immediately succeeding the Civil War. It is an honor to have belonged to it, or at least to have belonged to that majority in it whose acts determined its course and settled its place in history. The party had been elected on certain definite issues. Honestly and in good faith it set to work to solve the governmental problems presented to it according to the promises it had made before election. It was not in its power to solve them with complete success; but according to its opportunity it did solve them, by meeting them boldly and by doing the best that was possible to do under the circumstances.

A cleaner and more upright body of men in deliberation and in action than those who controlled and led the Fifty-first Congress has rarely been seen in any legislative body. They stood squarely on the party platform as to the tariff and other party matters. In addition they passed a number of admirable bills of a non-partisan character. Certain of these bills—the copyright bill for instance—went through the Senate and became laws; others, as the bankruptcy bill, failed, but for this the House was in no way responsible.

Nevertheless, though its legislative work was honorable and praiseworthy, the title of the Fifty-first Congress to a definite place in American history rests on other grounds. Above the question of what a Congress does comes the far higher question whether Congress can do anything at all. It was this question which the Fifty-first Congress

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

solved in the affirmative under the leadership of Speaker Reed, and its solution was of far greater permanent importance to the welfare of the United States and to the successful working of American institutions than any possible bill upon the tariff or the currency, or upon any other subject which may have seemed at the moment to be all-absorbing. The action of the Fifty-first Congress settled, and, as has since been proved, settled once for all, the fact that the national legislature was indeed a legislative body, and not a mere impotent debating society. By their settlement of this question Mr. Reed and his party colleagues not only won a title to the gratitude of every American who wishes well to America and who believes in free institutions, but laid under deep obligations all believers in representative government throughout the world. If a representative government can be reduced to the condition of the Polish Diet, then a representative government is the handmaid of helpless anarchy. Unless it is definitely settled that the legislature of the land has the power to legislate,—a power that cannot be taken away by revolutionary methods on the part of a disaffected minority,—there is no use in having a legislature at all. The party opponents of Mr. Reed and his colleagues in the House, and the people and the press, whether Democratic or so-called Independent, that supported them, stood as traitors to the cause of American institutions and of representative government; but Mr. Reed, and those who made him Speaker, stood for the very principles through whose triumph alone it is possible to retain that orderly liberty which is our national pride.

The Fifty-first Congress found before it as its great problem not what it should legislate about, but whether it should be allowed to legislate at all. Of recent years the practice of filibustering, or obstruction by the minority, in legislative bodies, had grown until it bade fair to put a complete stop to the wheels of government. All bodies of the kind must have rules under which they can be governed; and those rules must provide that the will of the majority shall prevail, save where it is explicitly provided to the contrary. Even minorities originally accepted these propositions as axiomatic; but gradually, all over the world, sharp parliamentarians who were sufficiently unscrupulous or sufficiently fanatical found that by taking advantage of rules intended merely to give proper freedom of debate they could not only hinder, but could entirely prevent legislation. The evil had grown steadily, and parliamentary bodies were rapidly being reduced to a position of utter impotence.

In the United States, Congress had, session after session, shown

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

itself to be more unwieldy and less able to enact even such legislation as the majority of the members desired. The evil grew very rapidly while Mr. Carlisle was Speaker. In the last session of the Fiftieth Congress, over which he presided, the House was kept absolutely stationary for nearly two weeks by a single Congressman, Mr. Weaver, who, because he could not get some of his own wild schemes advanced, proceeded effectively to block all legislation by continually proposing, in alternating succession, two or three separate motions; and when one was voted down or disposed of, immediately taking up another. Every intelligent student of our institutions saw the evil, and all those men who, without being politicians themselves, are fond of advocating more or less ideal political reforms in the magazines, were unanimous in their assertions that the practice of filibustering must be stopped, and that the first and vital reform in Congressional procedure ought to be the devising of a method by which legislation would become possible. Practical politicians took the same view. Those men who were not only practical politicians but also experts in political science, who combined a theoretical acquaintance with a practical experience of the actual evil of the system, were more determined than any others on the subject. Mr. Reed himself had written a magazine article in which he practically outlined the very system which he afterward put into operation.

Up to the time of the election of the Fifty-first Congress this had not been a party question. All sensible men, Republicans and Democrats alike, reprobated the existing system, and insisted that a change should be made. But when the Democrats found that they were in a small minority, and when, moreover, they realized that on certain points, such as the question of the tariff and of the supervision of elections, the successful party intended to legislate radically and in entire accordance with the platform on which it had been elected, they at once began to threaten that no legislation of which they did not approve would be allowed to become law. Their leader in the House, the Hon. Roger Q. Mills, definitely took this position, not merely in speech, but in a Review article. Putting aside any question as to the propriety or impropriety of the measures which the Republican party sought to pass, this proposition was simply an assertion that the will of the people, as shown in the Congressional elections of the preceding fall, should be nullified, and that the majority should not be allowed to control the Congress which by popular verdict had been delivered into their keeping.

Such a principle, if adopted and carried out to its logical conclusion, could have meant but one thing—the destruction of representative

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government. In the light of such a contest, for a principle so vital, it was really a very small matter what the Congress was to do in the way of enacting laws. The all-important thing for it to decide was its power to enact laws at all. The Fifty-first Congress met, Mr. Reed won the fight in the Speakership caucus of his party, and was formally inaugurated as Speaker. Immediately the battle began, to determine whether or not he and his party were to be allowed to use the power to which they were entitled by every consideration, moral and legal.

Before saying anything further about the struggle it is necessary to make clear one matter concerning which trouble has arisen by confounding officers of the same name with widely different duties. Many of our people show a tendency to turn to English precedent in any question of governmental procedure. These people knew that there was a Speaker of the House of Commons in England, and a Speaker of the House of Representatives here. Inasmuch as the names were the same they concluded that the duties ought to be the same, and that where the practice differed the American practice must be wrong; the last conclusion being an instance of the curious colonialism of spirit which still survives in a small section of our educated people.

Now, in reality, the Speaker of the House of Representatives corresponds as remotely to the Speaker of the House of Commons as the President of the United States to the President of the Swiss Republic. The Speaker of the House of Commons is not a party man at all; he is merely a moderator; he does not even change when parties change. He is unconcerned with promoting party policy. In the American House, on the contrary, the Speakership is the most important political office in the gift of the people, with the exception only of the Presidency. When the Congress and the President are of opposite political faith, then the Speaker is the man holding the highest political office in the power of his own party to bestow. He is responsible for the legislation of his party in the Lower House. He presides over the debates; but his great function is the leadership of his party. In some ways his duties correspond quite as closely to the duties of the English Prime Minister as to those of the English Speaker. Accordingly it is impossible to establish any common standard of judgment in dealing with him and the English Speaker.

Speaker Reed since the Fifty-first Congress has published a manual of general parliamentary law, under the title of "Reed's Rules." In the introduction he says:

"If the student has once fixed in his mind the idea that parliamentary law is not a series of arbitrary rules, but a plain consistent system founded on common

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sense and sanctioned by the experience of mankind, he will have gone far toward understanding it."

When he was first elected Speaker he proceeded to administer his office in entire accord with the principle he has here enunciated with so much clearness and brevity. The favorite weapons of the filibusters were two: to refuse a quorum, and to put dilatory motions. These indeed must always be the main weapons in filibustering, unless recourse is had to actual consumption of time by indefinite speech-making. The last can always be met by the adoption of a rule to take a vote at a certain hour or to limit speeches to a certain length. The only way to meet the question of dilatory motions is for the Speaker to refuse to put them. To get a quorum it is necessary to compel the attendance of members; but under the old rules of the House of Representatives a quorum consisted of those voting, not of those present. Speaker Reed met the movement of the filibusters with common sense and resolution. He refused to put motions which were evidently merely dilatory. He announced that he would count as present those who were present, whether they voted or not.

In no single instance was there even an accusation that Speaker Reed refused to put any motion made in good faith. Every motion which he refused to put was one avowedly made merely for dilatory purposes. Every man whom he refused to recognize was a man who avowedly desired to speak simply for the purpose of creating delay and of obstructing the action of the House. Those whom he counted as present actually were present. Indeed the last point of absurdity was reached when many men, including, for instance, Congressman, afterwards Governor, Flower, were loudly denouncing the Speaker for counting them present at the very moment when they were addressing him at the tops of their voices and declaring themselves constructively absent. Later, the Supreme Court of the United States decided that Mr. Reed was right in his position of counting a quorum, and the Democratic Fifty-third Congress adopted, in their substance, the rules which he had first promulgated to prevent the employment of dilatory tactics, and improper delay and obstruction generally. Yet at the time, egged on by their supporters outside, the Democratic minority went to all lengths in denunciation of the Speaker and in the effort to nullify his wise decision.

But neither the clamor from without nor the furious opposition within the House had any effect upon Mr. Reed: he remained inflexible in his purpose. In no House has there ever been given

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

greater opportunity for honest debate, and a wider latitude for the opinion and action of the minority, so long as that minority did not trespass on the rights of the majority; but with all his courtesy, and with all his fairness, Mr. Reed refused to be swayed by any threat or by any attempt at hostile action. He insisted upon the adoption of his principles; he wore out and beat down all antagonists by his magnificent courage and superior power.

A distinctly regrettable feature of the case was the way in which the acts of the filibustering minority were championed and defended by the party press hostile to Mr. Reed. I am sorry to say that I must include not merely the out-and-out party organs, but many that were professedly independent. Indeed, the attitude of certain newspapers that had been loud in their claims to independence of action, loud in their denunciation of partisanship, and in their asseverations that they stood for decent government without regard to party, was particularly objectionable. Filibustering has now become a recognized term by which to describe tactics of delay and obstruction in a legislative body. Of course such tactics are wholly indefensible except on revolutionary grounds. They are essentially improper. It should always be understood that it is discreditable to indulge in them save under circumstances which would justify any revolutionary proceeding; and such circumstances cannot occur once in a generation. Nevertheless, these tactics have become common of late years, and the party adherents of the filibustering minority are inclined to look not merely with complacency, but with hearty approval, upon efforts to break a quorum, to prevent a vote being taken, or to bring to a complete halt the legislative wheels; caring nothing for the disadvantage to the government, so long as a temporary party advantage can be gained. Of course if such methods ever become chronic representative government will be at an end. People cannot have free institutions if they lack the wisdom, self-command, and common sense to make use of them; and the people who condone and approve filibustering show that they lack all these qualities, and to that extent have forfeited their claim to be considered capable of governing themselves. This was especially true of those who took part in and those who applauded the filibustering in the Fifty-first Congress. It was lamentable and discreditable to see how many of the men who had been clamoring for political, and notably for legislative, reform, were included in this number. A great many of these men, many of whom had been writing on behalf of just such changes of procedure as Mr. Reed introduced, were opposed to him on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the tariff; and they actually permitted a difference upon purely economic questions to blind them to the propriety of Mr. Reed's course as a presiding officer, instead of doing as they should have done, had they themselves possessed the courage and independence which they professed to demand in others. Instead of upholding Mr. Reed in a struggle in which his success was of vital consequence to the future well-being of republican institutions, they joined, and even led, the chorus of fanatical attacks upon him, showing themselves willing to do lasting damage to the cause of good government provided only they could at the moment score a party triumph.

Read in cold blood now, the appeals of the Congressmen on the floor and of the writers and speakers outside the House against the "tyranny" of Mr. Reed, and in favor of "free debate," seem so absurd that it is hard to discuss them with patience. One of the difficulties in meeting their arguments arose from the very fact that their arguments were not worth meeting. The mere definition of the three branches of our government was a sufficient answer to everything that they had to say. Congress is the legislative body. To legislate means to make laws, not merely to talk about them. The laws should be made after debate, but the debate should be wholly subsidiary to the actual voting, and should be conducted in good faith with this object in view. Under the Reed rules there was ample opportunity for debate. In fact the pages of the "Congressional Record" show that there was more debate in the Fifty-first than in any preceding Congress.

When the debates of a legislative body occupy a series of volumes so large and so numerous as those of the Encyclopedia Britannica, it is not worth while to answer the assertion that debate was strangled in that Congress. The published writings of all our great political leaders, from the days of Washington and Hamilton to those of Lincoln and Seward, could easily be contained many times over in the volumes which record the debates of the Fifty-first Congress.

Under Speaker Reed's rules in that Congress there was ample opportunity for all proper debate; but when there had to be a choice between speech and action, the choice fell on action. Whenever this choice had to be made, it must be remembered that the fault lay wholly with Mr. Reed's opponents, and not with himself or with his supporters. When the former by their foolish filibustering forced the majority to undertake repressive measures, they were themselves responsible for these repressive measures. They had abundant time for all legitimate discussion of every measure put through by the Re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

publican majority. When they abused the ample privileges accorded them, Mr. Reed and his party associates would have failed in their duty to the nation had they not seen that the abuse was checked and punished. Because of Mr. Reed's course as Speaker he became the most conspicuous leader in a party which contained at the time at least three other men who by their position and prominence were entitled to strive for national leadership; and he won his position by the extraordinary ability and iron courage with which he championed a radical revolution in our methods of applying the principles of parliamentary procedure. For a year he was the most prominent figure in our public life, and his actions and deeds were quoted, with approval or disapproval, in every parliamentary body throughout Christendom. They were the theme of almost every publicist in every free country where the parliamentary system, that is, where government by a legislative and deliberative body, obtains.

Then in the fall of 1890, the Republican party went down with a crash. In the Fifty-first Congress Mr. Reed was Speaker, and at the head of a small but singularly compact and united majority. In the Fifty-second he found himself the leader of a minority that included but a fourth of all the members of the House. With the greatest ostentation the triumphant party proceeded to undo the work he had done and to restore the ancient order of things. They could do as they wished, for they outnumbered their opponents three to one; and for the two years of their Congressional existence, though they showed themselves inefficient and unwieldy in comparison with the Fifty-first Congress, they were still able to make matters move.

In the Fifty-third Congress they came back with a large, although reduced majority; but the effervescence of their victory had vanished, and they were forced by grim necessity to acknowledge that they had attempted an impossible task when they undertook to restore the cumbrous system of parliamentary procedure which Mr. Reed had assailed and overthrown. Already the Supreme Court of the United States had decided that as regards the most savagely criticised of Mr. Reed's rulings he was in the right and his critics in the wrong; and now the hostile Democratic majority, utterly unable to accomplish anything, and seeing the House reduced to mere unwieldy helplessness before their eyes, were forced to abandon all their positions and to take up and re-enact the Reed rules. In other words, the defeated leader actually saw his foes while still in power obliged to adopt the very principles because of which they had persuaded the people to oust him from control.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was a kind of triumph such as rarely befalls any man; and it was followed by another triumph which rendered it complete. At the general election in 1894 the Republicans were returned to power by a vote far greater than they had ever yet received in their forty years of existence as a national party; and Mr. Reed was re-elected Speaker of a House which contained a greater Republican majority than any previous Congress had shown.

It is indeed hard to realize that when Mr. Reed put through the rules which have come to be known by his name he was not only denounced furiously as "czar," as "tyrant," as what not, but that the minority took the unusual step of refusing to join in the customary vote of thanks to him when he left the Speakership. The subsequent actions of his opponents were his final vindication, as well as the most severe condemnation of what they themselves had done. The Reed rules represented the mere application of common sense, courage, and honesty to parliamentary procedure. So evident did this become that his very opponents while still in power were themselves forced to adopt his rules, and the people, by an overwhelming majority, undid the wrong they had done and replaced him as Speaker; only in a position far more secure and far more triumphant than when he had first held the chair, for he had back of him an enormously increased majority. There have been times when a statesman has triumphed after defeat because he himself has changed; but in this case it is not Reed who has changed—it is the popular feeling. His position remains unaltered. He consistently maintained the righteousness and justice of his proceedings, and his bitter political enemies were forced by the hard logic of events to acknowledge that they had been wrong and that he had been right. Rarely in the history of American politics has any statesman received so dramatically complete a vindication.

Speaker Reed rendered a great service to his party by his action as Speaker of the Fifty-first Congress; and, by the fact of having rendered this service, placed himself at one leap among the foremost of the party leaders; but he rendered an even greater service to the American Republic. In order that a republic may exist there must be some form of representative government, and this representative government must include a legislature. If the practices to which Mr. Reed put a stop were allowed to become chronic, representative government would itself be an impossibility. Not for many years has there been a man in our public life to whom the American people owe as great a debt as they do to Speaker Thomas B. Reed.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ETHICS OF PARTY LOYALTY.

If a popular mandate could ever be inferred from the results of a single election, it is certain that the demands of the majority of voters in the State of New York were clearly formulated and emphatically expressed in the political revolution of November, 1894. The sweeping Republican victory, carrying the Governorship and both Houses of the Legislature, meant—if ever votes were cast upon a distinct political issue—that the Republican party was pledged, and that the people of the State had accepted the promise, to enact with as little delay as possible the reform measures demanded by the people of New York city to give effect to the popular revolt against the men and the methods of Tammany Hall.

With any sort of efficient and responsible leadership, with any real and effective party discipline, that result would have been reached early in the session. Yet for lack of a capable leader, backed by a sanction strong enough to enforce the fulfilment of party pledges, the great opportunity was worse than thrown away. The Republican majority weakened and split, and the session ended to the relief of the people and the lasting discredit of the party throughout the State. The reform measures unconditionally promised and confidently expected were "hung up" month after month, and those of them which attained final enactment were passed in emasculated form to suit the views of a wholly irresponsible, outside boss, whose real opinions on any of the great political questions of the day are absolutely unknown, whose work is done in secret, and who never comes directly before the people to answer for the way in which he stands between them and their rights.

On the Democratic side, in national politics, like causes in the past have produced like effects. If there ever was a time when a national party came back to power on the strength of a single, definite issue, and with instructions from the people clearly expressed, it was so with the Democrats in 1892. The negative and corrective part of their programme they were able to and did carry out with commendable promptness in the succeeding session of Congress. The Silver Pur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chase Clause of the Sherman Bill was repealed; the Federal Election Law was wiped from the statute book, and the administration of the Pension Bureau was reformed. But when the positive and constructive work of the session began the inherent weakness of the party organization cropped out, disintegration set in, party pledges were forgotten or flagrantly broken, leaders lost their grip, and even the show of deference to authority was flouted. What should have been a great political battle, fought out on strict party lines and ending in a great Democratic triumph, degenerated into a series of guerilla attacks and marauding skirmishes, where individual preferences and private interests swept all regard to party loyalty or fidelity to political pledges out of sight. The Democrats of the United States were forced to look on in bitter impotence while a victorious majority, controlling both branches of the national legislature, with the party's leader in the President's chair, broke into a set of log-rolling cliques which traded votes on every schedule. Finally, loyal party men in the great Democratic city of New York were treated to the humiliating spectacle of members of Congress, elected by Democratic votes upon a distinct party issue and pledge, refusing their support to what was at least an honest attempt to redeem that pledge, repudiating their political obligations and openly seeking to defeat a party measure at the insolent dictation of a local boss, whose views upon the tariff, if he ever had any, were about as clear and important as those of a Bowery "tough" on the Nebular Hypothesis.

So far as any comparison between the two great national parties is concerned, it must be conceded, and Democratic politicians had better face the fact, that their opponents have shown, on the whole, a capacity for more effective organization and better discipline, when in control of a Congressional majority. They have been able more often to enforce cohesive action, when union was necessary to ensure at least a measure of deference to the popular will and the party's promises. It is little to say, and the superiority is slight and comparative only; but it counts for something when contrasted with the conspicuous fact of recent Democratic majorities — their lack of a leader, sufficiently backed by public opinion within his party, who could hold together his heterogeneous following long enough to enforce agreement and pass constructive measures of national policy. In opposition the Democratic party has from time to time been capable of united action for purposes of destructive criticism and attack. But when called upon to formulate a constructive programme, to frame a measure of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

finance or a tariff bill, the moment an effort was made to subject its majority to the only real test of effectiveness—affirmative action—at that moment the majority split into fragments and pulled in as many ways as there were parts—*tot homines quot sententiæ*.

In the national election of 1888 the Democrats were defeated upon an issue about which there could be no mistake. A definite, clear-cut question was put before the people with characteristic frankness and honesty by Mr. Cleveland in his famous tariff message of December, 1887, and he went out of office with the clear understanding that the policy of revenue reform—the broad lines of which he had formulated and which his party had adopted—was not acceptable to the majority in those States whose electoral votes decided the contest; and the Republicans went into power definitely pledged to an opposite policy. To their credit, be it said, the tariff legislation of 1890 was a fairly honest attempt to give definite shape to the policy of high protection, and to carry out the pledges of the preceding National and Congressional elections.

It is manifestly easier to hold together the forces of a minority than those of a majority. The attitude of opposition is for the most part an attitude of negation and attack; it has its foundation and strength in sentiments which every member of the minority may be counted on, with reasonable certainty, to share. The leaders of a majority, on the other hand, from whom positive and affirmative action is demanded, are forced to rely upon and employ motives of a radically different nature, the control of which is far more difficult because of the fact—sociological rather than merely political—that men when called upon for affirmative action are notoriously of more heterogeneous opinion than when asked to join in a policy of fault-finding and attack. All men will unite to condemn abuses; few are willing to subordinate their personal opinions when asked to produce a remedy. In opposition concerted action is, generally speaking, a matter of course. When given the power and called upon to use it the weakness of a multitude of counsellors becomes apparent. The same causes which have their roots deep down in human nature, and which gave coherence and homogeneity to the efforts of the Republicans in the Congresses of 1888 and 1894, made it possible for the Democrats to act with effective unanimity in 1890 and 1892. It was that cohesiveness in opposition which gave to each party in turn a temporary success, and to each, in turn, from lack of unity came defeat.

That parties are not divided to-day upon lines which indicate real

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

political differences is due, not to an excess, but rather to a deficiency of party discipline. What both the great political organizations in this country need to-day is that sort of party discipline which encourages the development of a real political leader and endows him with control sufficient to secure from his followers the support which is his due. Democracy, in its insistence upon the right of the individual to unhampered freedom of individual action, often loses sight of the right of society to the best results of concerted action—results attainable only by recognizing the fact that, notwithstanding the equal rights of men before the law, there are and forever will be inequalities of talent, ability, training, and opportunity. These are the conditions from which leaders and leadership are necessarily evolved. And when the best results can be secured only by concerted action under a recognized head, the cultivation of a spirit of deference to authority, and the suppression of that assertive Americanism which insists upon equal weight for all opinions, become a prime necessity and the first duty of statesmanship. There is no more delusive and mischievous notion than the idea that, in a Democracy, all men should at all times stand on a level, and that leaders are out of place. What we need on both sides of the political field is a leader of judgment, force, sagacity, and will, backed by a public opinion within the party strong enough to hold up his hands and enforce his authority.

This want of legitimate party discipline, defeating so often the will of the voters and preventing the accomplishment of what they demand, emphasizes the fact that men who are actively engaged in political life —in the control and management of parties and organizations—ought to be held to a much closer rule of party loyalty. If this be not insisted upon, what a recent English reviewer has called the "fissiparous" tendency of parties to disintegrate into factions is sure to result, with the inevitable evolution of the wire-puller and the boss.

"The sole way of enabling a popular assembly to exercise representative power with safety is to divide it into great, coherent, disciplined party organizations. When such organizations exist they will necessarily be guided by the ablest men, who become responsible for their guidance, who can count upon the habitual support of a large body of followers, and who therefore represent a permanent, calculable force in the political field." [1]

Whenever this factional disintegration, the inevitable consequence of a lack of leadership and party responsibility, sets in, and the divergences

[1] Lecky's "England in the 18th Century," Vol. III, p. 117.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of politicians fail to represent genuine differences in principle, the result, as Mr. Lecky has pointed out, is that—

"—such a state of affairs always brings with it grave political dangers and is peculiarly unfavorable to real earnestness in public life. Faction represents party, personal pretensions acquire an inordinate weight, and there is much reason to fear lest the tone of political honor should be lowered and lest the public spirit of the nation should decline."

This lack of real leadership, this want of party discipline of sufficient strength to enforce the keeping of party pledges, even at the risk of personal loss, begets another and a deeper evil—the irresponsible boss. He is the leader who becomes, *outside* the legislature, more powerful than any of the so-called leaders within it. He is the political dictator whose work is done under cover, whose methods and opinions are beyond the reach of criticism, and who controls the course of legislation, often in the very teeth of public opinion, except on those rare occasions when public clamor rises to the height of a popular revolt. Sir Henry Maine writes :—

"In wide democracies, political power is divided into morsels, and each man's portion of it is almost infinitesimally small. . . . In popular governments resting on a wide suffrage . . . the leader, whether or not he be cunning or eloquent, or well provided with commonplaces, will be the wire-puller. The process of cutting up political power into petty fragments has in him its most remarkable product. . . . The political *chiffonier* who collects and utilizes the fragments is the wire-puller." [1]

Sir James Fitzjames Stephen has remarked the same politico-sociological fact :—

"The man who can sweep up the greatest number of fragments of political power into one heap will govern the rest. . . . In a pure democracy the ruling men will be the wire-pullers and their friends." [2]

International comparisons based upon superficial points of resemblance in matters social, political, or literary are quite likely to mislead when meant to illustrate, and are very apt to show that *saugrenu* quality, or spirit of "impudent absurdity," which Matthew Arnold called the bane of international criticism. So when we talk of party government and party discipline, and attempt to illustrate by analogies drawn from the field of English politics, it is well to bear in mind Mr. Bage-

[1] "Popular Government," pp. 30, 31.
[2] "Liberty, Fraternity, Equality," p. 239.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hot's concise summary of the essential distinctions between English and American political systems. He writes:—

"Constituency government is the precise opposite of parliamentary government; it is the government of immoderate persons, far from the scene of action, instead of the government of moderate persons close to the scene of action; it is the judgment of persons judging in the last resort and without a penalty, in lieu of persons judging in fear of a dissolution and ever conscious that they are subject to an appeal."[1]

The decision of an American legislative caucus which has no real sanction to enforce it, and the action of an English Cabinet meeting which carries an obligation more binding than any known to American political life, are two radically different things; and though there are signs not far from the surface which indicate that Englishmen are beginning to chafe against the enormous power and absolute secrecy of their political machine, we, on the other hand, are forced to admit that our own loose system of heterogeneous and irresponsible legislative committees—owing no common allegiance and under no authoritative head—is unfit to meet the needs of the times. Both Macaulay and Lecky have described the English Cabinet "as one of the most momentous and least noticed consequences of the Revolution."[2] Yet a man of such a nice sense of personal honor as Sir Robert Peel declared himself entirely satisfied with a system which requires a member of the Government to support measures which he disapproves, and even to use upon the floor of the House the very arguments which he has vainly combated in council. "I should be sorry to think," he once said, "that the practice carries any stain with it." Even so enthusiastic an admirer of the British Constitution as Mr. Bagehot was forced to say of this declaration: "It may not carry a stain, but it is a painful idea."[3] It is a system which has, indeed, obvious demerits and more than one English student of public affairs has pointed them out. Sir Henry Maine, commenting on the extraordinary way in which the Cabinet has gradually drawn to itself all the powers of the Crown, assuming the enormous right of initiating legislation and controlling the whole course of government, calls it "the great modern paradox of the British Constitution."[4]

No more striking instance of the difference between English parlia-

[1] "Bagehot's Works," Vol. IV, p. 169.
[2] Lecky's "England in the 18th Century," Vol. I, p. 242.
[3] "Bagehot's Works," Vol. III, p. 24.
[4] "Popular Government," p. 236.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mentary party discipline and the lack of it in American legislative bodies could be cited than the extraordinary way in which party leaders on both sides, in the last session of Congress, were overridden and party lines broken on the question of appropriations. The chairman and the majority members of this important committee joined with the Republican leaders in protesting against the sugar bounty, insisting that the national treasury was in no condition to stand the proposed grant. Yet, in spite of all they could say and do, the rank and file on both sides broke from their leaders and carried the extravagant gratuity by a heavy vote. For partisan, if not for patriotic reasons, some means of enforcing party discipline must be devised by which such unscrupulous and irresponsible guerillas may be fought off.

While it is true that effective party action in any legislative assembly is conditioned by obedience to a definite line of party action, we have at present only one way—and a very clumsy way at that—of securing a definite expression of the party policy and will. This is the decision of the caucus, where a mere numerical majority controls, and where a handful of newly elected legislators—unfamiliar, perhaps, with the questions to be decided; unfamiliar, certainly, with the conditions and procedure under which they are to be treated—may reverse by their action the policy of a national party. It is this which has brought the caucus into disrepute, even though it be still the only recognized method of securing that concerted action, without which party organization cannot be effective. Men of long experience in public life, with ripe knowledge and strong convictions, hesitate to enter a conference under an implied pledge to be bound by the vote of a bare majority, when that majority may be made up of men with little experience, less knowledge, and no convictions at all. There is bound to be a galling sense of responsibility for irresponsible action, an uneasy consciousness, as Washington Gladden puts it, "that if they come into caucuses, they must leave their consciences where the Mussulman leaves his shoes—outside the door."

While it is impossible and undesirable to lay down any hard and fast rule, it is reasonable to hope and expect that conscientious public men will come to feel in time that while the legislative caucus may be a necessary wheel in the machinery of party organization, enforcing unity so as to give effect to certain agreed principles and secure the fulfilment of political promises, it is an institution at the base of which must lie the implied understanding that only up to a certain point is the man who takes part in it bound to subordinate his personal judg-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment to that of the majority; and that point is reached when the proposed action of the majority is opposed in conscience to the deliberate judgment of the individual. But at that point the burden of proof lies on the individual. Let him be very sure that it is a conscientious scruple, and not the pride of opinion or the pressure of personal interests or ambition, that leads him to revolt. By all means let him break with his party, if to be honest he must; but let him take the consequences manfully, and not complain if the penalties of party discipline are certain and severe. And the more certain and severe those penalties are the better it will be, both as an earnest of good faith, if he fronts them bravely, and as a warning to all men in public life that party ties and political pledges are not to be lightly assumed or lightly broken. The caucus may take wrong views; but a wrong policy is not so dangerous as that sort of conduct on the part of public men which fosters mutual distrust and cultivates among voters the habitual suspicion—which soon hardens into a cynical belief—that each representative is working for himself alone, with little regard for the party as a whole, and no respect for pledges whose acceptance was the condition of his nomination and election.

When a man has been identified for years with a political organization, his sudden conversion, even to the better cause, carries with it, at best, an offensive taint, and it is right that he should be held to the strictest accountability; and if he suffers severely for the faith that is in him, so much the better for his own honor and the cause for which he stands. Public confidence, and faith in the honor of public men, demand that the reasons and above all the disinterestedness of such conversions should be clear as the noonday sun. A glance at the relative positions of Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Hartington, now the Duke of Devonshire, in the eyes of the English public without regard to party, is enough to emphasize this distinction. Both broke from Mr. Gladstone on the Home Rule issue. The one had nothing to gain by going over to the Conservatives, while the other seems to have won, since his conversion, at least a social advantage which he had not before; and somehow the gain is, rightly or wrongly, marked to his discredit. It may not be a very black or a very deep mark; but it is a mark, all the same, and it is likely to stay. When Bishop Colenso startled Anglican orthodoxy by his renunciation of the Pentateuch, the blow which told most against him, even with that portion of the British public which admired his boldness and candor, was the hint that his sense of personal honor would have been more strongly empha-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sized had he resigned the bishopric. On the other hand, all the world applauded the action of those followers of Peel and Cobden who, when elected as protectionists, were subsequently persuaded to vote for a repeal of the Corn Laws; and who, when their constituents murmured at the change of front, showed a keen sense of what was due to party loyalty and personal honor by instantly resigning their seats, so as to give to the electors the opportunity to reject or ratify their course.

It is futile to expect of the ordinary legislator either respect for the nominal party leader on the floor, or fidelity to platform promises formulated on declared party lines, when there is no sanction to enforce obedience; and such expectations are equally futile when the caucus itself is controlled, not by deference either to intelligent public opinion, party responsibility, or leaders of acknowledged experience and ability, but by the secret influence of an outsider whose control of the machinery of elections is in great part dependent upon concealment of the very agencies by which he works. When we elect representatives pledged to a certain line of political action, and then fail to secure the remedial legislation which has been called for in plain terms by a large majority of the voters, we are inclined either to throw up our hands in discouragement, or to tire our lungs in the indiscriminate denunciation of leaders and parties. We fail to distinguish, and we lose sight of the fact, that for want of a responsible and controlling leader, and of a party organization in touch with and directly responsible to the voters, the business of politics is sure to fall into the hands of the irresponsible boss; and a little discernment would show that his very irresponsibility is bound sooner or later to influence him to the selection of men who grow more and more subservient, and to the adoption of methods which become more and more corrupt. The great mass of respectable and upright men vote their straight party ticket nine times out of ten; and think that they are doing their full duty as independent citizens, and emphasizing their devotion to conscience and principle, by bolting an unfit nomination once in ten years. The trouble is that they do not exercise enough freedom from party ties themselves, and do not insist upon greater loyalty to party from those who are in active public life as politicians and party men. Upon these latter the strictest political obligation ought to be laid. They make up that very small minority on each side who manage the machinery of politics, select the candidates, nine times out of ten, or are themselves named for public office. If the claims of party rested lightly upon the great mass of citizens and voters, so that the independent shifting vote became a larger and more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

uncertain factor year by year,—while men in public life were held to a much closer rule of party loyalty,—not only would political managers be forced to put the best men in nomination, and to declare their purposes and pledges in plain terms, but the representative when elected would feel behind him the encouragement and backing, as well as the warning and reminder, of a powerful and effective public opinion. Then loyalty to party and to leadership would be rightly insisted upon as a condition of continuance in public life.

The relations of party and the conditions of American political life to-day call for a higher standard of public opinion, a more intelligent and discriminating criticism of political action—a criticism which will denounce disloyalty to party and to party pledges, demand deference to authority, hold up the hands of men who have shown their ability to lead, and insist that they shall be loyally followed.

GEORGE WALTON GREEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TRAIL OF "TRILBY."

HEINE recommended people to behave in front of a picture as they would behave in the presence of royalty or of exalted personages; that is, to stand perfectly still and silent until the picture spoke to them. For more years than I care to remember I have adopted his advice, not only with regard to pictures, but also with regard to statues, public monuments, stage-plays, musical compositions of all kinds, and especially with regard to books. There was no reason why I should act differently with regard to Mr. du Maurier's "Trilby," and assuredly I have had my reward, for from its very first pages the book spoke to me with no uncertain voice; almost every line started an echo in my mind and sometimes in my breast. There are echoes and echoes. There are echoes that sound like the raucous cries of pain of the patient writhing under the scalpel of the operator; there are others like lullabies transporting one to dreamland,—and when one has no fear of "what dreams may come," it is sweet to dream. "Oh, my youth, it's you that's being buried," exclaims Murger's *Rodolphe*, with heartrending egoism, as he stands by the open grave of *Mimi*. "Oh, my youth, it's you that's being resuscitated," I hummed to myself while reading "Trilby": and if for nothing else I owe its author sincere and humble thanks.

For, with every leaf I turned, the reminiscences of that happily spent youth became more vivid, the real names of the streets stared at me through their cleverly conceived disguises, and for some hours I too had my Indian summer—of recollections. I beheld myself as a stripling, with no care for to-morrow, wandering about Paris (the Paris of the late 'fifties and early 'sixties) arm-in-arm with a grand-uncle of mine, and drawing deep breaths of joy,—the simplest, most inexpensive, and best of all joys, *la joie de vivre*,—imbibing at the same time, and unconsciously as it were, large potations of history, inasmuch as, though no dunce, I could be taught in no other way. And for the purpose of teaching a lad of my age fragments of history on the very scenes where the events were enacted, to what better spot could the teacher have taken him than to the Place and Rue St. André des Arts, the Rue Gît-le-Cœur (the "Place St. Anatole des Arts" and the "Rue

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

du Puits d'Amour" of the story), and their adjacent *congeries* of blind alleys, winding passages, and narrow streets. Nearly every stone of that *locale* furnishes the eloquent record of a phase in the life of the city which *Little Billee* and *the Laird* and *Taffy* and *Trilby* loved so well and not altogether unwisely.

Within a stone's throw of the Rue St. André des Arts stood the Tower of Nesle, so dear to the lovers of the romantic drama, although there is not a particle of evidence to show that the crimes laid to the charge of Marguerite de Bourgogne by Alexandre Dumas in his wonderful play were committed there. Marguerite's orgies, as well as those of her two sisters-in-law, Blanche de la Marche and Jeanne de Poictiers, took place far away from the capital; but legend has grafted many tales of unhallowed passion and gruesome *dénouement* on the mansion built by Amaury de Nesle, some of which are unquestionably true. It was to the Hôtel de Nesle[1] that in 1574 Henriette de Clèves, the wife of Louis de Gonzague, Duc de Nevers, brought the head of her lover, Annibal de Coconnas, after it had been exposed on the Place de Grève. She had it embalmed, and kept it for many years in a closet behind her bed. The same room was inhabited nearly half a century afterward by her grand-daughter, Marie Louise de Gonzague de Clèves, whose lover, Cinq-Mars, met with a similar fate to that of Coconnas at the hands of Cardinal Richelieu.

More interesting than all this to those with a strain of British blood in their veins is the connection of the Rue St. André des Arts with the prologue to the English occupation of the French capital under Henry V,—Shakespeare's *King Hal.* The Buci Gate was within a furlong of that street, and fancy, peering into the dim, distant past, might behold the eight hundred archers of the Seigneur de l'Isle Adam marching one summer night, stealthily and in Indian file, across the open space on which *Mr. William Bagot*, the famous English painter that was to be, gazed so often from his studio window four centuries

[1] The word *hôtel*, in old as well as modern French, is nearly always used to designate the sumptuous town-residence of a princely or merely wealthy personage, or a public building belonging to the State, as well as a mere "hostelry" in the limited meaning of the English term; hence the "Hôtel de Ville" (the Town Hall), the "Hôtel Dieu" (a hospital), the "Hôtel de la Monnaie" (the Mint), etc. It was ignorance of this fact that led the vulgar English parvenu into his lamentable and ridiculous blunder. "Did you see the Hôtel de Ville?" asked a friend on the parvenu's return from Paris. "Did we see it?" was the answer; "we stopped there, and a pretty bill they made out." He was under the impression that the Hôtel de Ville was simply another Hôtel Continental or Hôtel Bristol, and saw the opportunity for a bit of display.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and four decades afterward. The archers had entered by the Buci Gate, the keys of which were handed to their leader by Perrinet-Leclerc, son of the alderman of that quarter, and who had abstracted them from under his father's pillow while the worthy magistrate was asleep. The archers wended their way across the bridge of St. Michel hard by, to the Place du Châtelet, where they were joined by a thousand or more banditti in the pay of the Duc de Bourgogne. United they repaired to the Hôtel St. Paul, the royal residence of the demented Charles VI, who was persuaded to place himself at their head, and the tragedy, the evolution of which made a poor, lowly peasant girl of southern Lorraine immortal throughout the ages, had virtually begun.

Twenty-one years later (November 12, 1439), the Rue St. André des Arts and its immediate neighborhood witnessed another scene of that tragedy, which, contrary to the accepted rules, ended happily. That time it was part of the epilogue that was being enacted there. On that day Charles VII made his triumphal entry into his good city of Paris. A general holiday had been commanded, and the inhabitants of the riverside quarter, to mark their horror of Perrinet-Leclerc's treachery, hurled the statue erected to him by the butchers of the Duc de Bourgogne (Jean Sans Peur, who himself was assassinated by some of the followers of the future king on the bridge at Montereau in 1419) from its pedestal in the Place St. Michel (not the present Place St. Michel, but an open space somewhat higher up). They decapitated the effigy, and dragged its headless trunk up and down the Rue St. André des Arts, along the same road the archers of De l'Isle Adam had gone; then they dragged it back again as far as the angle of the Rue de la Vieille Bouclerie (the "Rue Vieille des Trois Mauvais Ladres" of Mr. du Maurier) where they hewed it into a kerbstone,—a necessary thing in times when there was no distinction between the footway and the road. In the early 'sixties, when I went to the Rue St. André des Arts for the first time, my grand-uncle showed me the supposed stone; but, much as I liked and revered him and admired his historical knowledge, I should nowadays want a better guarantee for the authenticity of that bit of granite than the recollection of his bare word. Of the authenticity of the facts I have just stated in connection with the statue of Perrinet-Leclerc there is, however, not the smallest doubt.

My grand-uncles were surgeons, and in those days few surgeons, whether French or foreign, strolled into the Latin Quarter by way of the Pont St. Michel, especially if accompanied by some one less famil-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

iar with the history of their science than they, without paying a flying visit to the Rue St. Severin[1] and its remaining cemetery, the latter of which was reputed to have been the scene of the first serious operation of lithotomy in France. This happened as early as 1451. The patient was a bowman of Louis XI, who had been sentenced to be hanged. He was known to be suffering from stone, and a monk (Jacques de Beaulieu?) claimed him, in the interest of science and humanity, as a subject upon whom to perform his experiment. As a matter of course, the condemned man was in no way consulted, nor was there a promise of a remission of his sentence in case the experiment should prove successful. As it happened, the experiment did succeed; in about three weeks the soldier felt himself a new man, and Louis XI made him a present of his life.

There are other scenes connected with the Rue St. André des Arts and its neighborhood, which, though less gruesome, are not less important from a historical point of view. Perhaps the most important of all was that enacted at the lower end of the street one April evening of the year 1784. The open space once occupied by the Buci Gate was literally blocked up by the tail of a long string of carriages, the foremost of which reached as far as the Comédie Française (the Odéon of the present day). Every one of those gorgeous conveyances bore on its panel the scutcheon of some historic family, for it was the *première* of "Le Mariage de Figaro," and since eight that morning the doors of the theatre had been besieged by plebeians and patricians alike, —some of the latter, men and women, having brought their dinners with them, which they were content to eat in the actors' dressing-rooms.

Enough of historical anecdote. I did not intend my pen to run away with me like this. There is, however, one excuse for my excursion. Many a Nimrod, while following a trail, has had his progress barred by the dead body of a magnificent lion or tiger before coming up with his living quarry, and in his enthusiastic admiration of the splendid proportions of the former, in his desire to get possession of its skin and its head, in his artistic impulse to take a sketch of it as it lay there, though dead, allowed the other to escape. That I am not going to do. The whole of Mr. du Maurier's *dramatis personæ* have taken such a firm hold of the little imagination I possess that it has become a question of my escape, not of theirs. I should have liked to be a

[1] The beginning of the Rue St. Severin was then being pulled down to make room for the Place and Boulevard St. Michel.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

kind of Niebuhr to them, from *Dodor*, *Zouzou*, and *Gecko* up to *Little Billee* and *Trilby O'Ferrall*, for in some shape or other I have known the counterparts of nearly all, living and breathing in the atmosphere in which they breathed, and in their habit as they lived. As it is, *Trilby* must come first; for I have known, perhaps, a half-dozen Trilbys, all differing in accidentals from each other and from our heroine, but alike in essentials. It proves to me that Mr. du Maurier went to work in the right way in delineating a human type instead of creating a more or less phenomenal human being. Astonishing though it may seem to those who are not familiar with the inner life of the French artists' models,—I have no knowledge of the English, and am not aware that they exist as a class,—the susceptibility of a great many of them to hypnotic influence, especially among the female members, is an ascertained fact. What *Svengali* did in such terrible earnestness and with such terrible results to poor *Trilby* is done out of sheer fun almost every day by the pupils at the "Beaux Arts," at private drawing-schools, and the *académies libres*.

The explanation of that state of susceptibility is not far to seek. At all those classes the model poses for four hours, with ten minutes' interval between each forty minutes, provided the attitude required be a fairly normal one,—and the term "fairly normal" as understood by the schools is very elastic. The most casual observer cannot but conclude that the model during that time must suffer cruelly from his or her enforced immobility. I say "enforced immobility," but the expression is not altogether correct. If we watch the model a little more closely than usual, we soon become aware of a certain oscillation of her whole body, a swaying from right to left or from left to right, an almost imperceptible but nevertheless real backward or forward movement. There is nothing graceful or light about the shake, it is heavy and mechanical and reminds one of a statue or a tall house tottering on its base previous to its fall. In fact, the watcher himself unconsciously imitates it, in his fear lest the model should come down at full length and head-foremost off the platform. That fear, however, is groundless. The model is as safe as a sleep-walker on the ledge of a roof. A few moments after she has got into the right posture, she begins to stare vacantly into space, her limbs become rigid, and she scarcely hears what is being said to her. Though her eyes are wide open, she is practically asleep, and that by her own will. At the outset of her career, when the fatigue of standing still for nearly three-quarters of an hour at a time was very irksome and perhaps painful, she endeav-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ored "not to think," and in a little while she[1] has succeeded so well as to get some kind of rest in a vertical position.

Very often to the model's cost, the *rapin—anglicé*, sucking painter—is a mischievous young animal, though, as a rule, good-natured to a fault. But he dearly loves a practical joke, and when the joking fit is on him he does not stop to consider the consequences so far as his selected victim is concerned. As a matter of fact, this tendency on the model's part "to throw herself into a trance" is no new thing. Among the notes whence sprang the first chapter of "An Englishman in Paris," I have at least two dealing with the subject. Equally, of course, the *rapin* of three, four, and five decades ago was just as mischievous as he is now, and perhaps more so, though he is troublesome enough at present. What more natural, from his own point of view, than that he should try to improve upon the model's method for getting the desired rest. There is the opportunity for a huge piece of *fumisterie*, with the additional advantages of obliging the poor model, his fellow-*rapins*, and himself. So, if he have the power of magnetically sending the former to sleep, that is, of throwing her into a state of catalepsy, he unhesitatingly avails himself of that power, looking round for the thanks of the rest. "*Hein, c'est bien fait*," he exclaims; "*elle ne bougera pas, et nous n'aurons pas besoin de la rappeler à l'ordre.*"

Unfortunately many of those youngsters have that power, and a few of them exercised it to such a purpose that there was an outcry, and the authorities had to interfere. The chief culprit was a young fellow who for some considerable time had attended the lectures of the late Dr. Charcot, and, rather than waste the knowledge he had acquired, he applied it indiscriminately to no matter whom—models and fellow-workers alike. One of the latter provided the comic element of the entertainments by doing the most outrageous and grotesque things, until, one day, having a perilous acrobatic feat suggested to him by the operator, he split his skull on the edge of the model-platform[2] and had to be taken to the hospital.

The affair was hushed up, and it ought to have been a warning, but it was not; our amateur Charcot continued to experimentalize, and finally selected for his "subject" a girl of great plastic beauty; per-

[1] I adopt the feminine pronoun because women are more apt to yield to that temptation than men.

[2] I have no doubt that Mr. du Maurier's English equivalent "model-throne" for "*table de pose*" is more correct than mine, but somehow I do not like it and will use "model-platform" instead.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

haps one of the most perfect specimens of the human form the world has ever seen, the well-known Élise Duval, the favorite model of MM. Gérôme and Benjamin Constant. Of a highly-strung, nervous temperament and very playful disposition, Élise Duval showed even a greater tendency to become "sport" for the hypnotizer, whether amateur or professional, than the majority of her sister-models, and one day, at the beginning of a *séance*, she was thrown into a trance which lasted for four hours, at the end of which time she was awakened more dead than alive. She was suffering from a violent headache, her legs refused to carry her, every one of her limbs felt sore, and she had to be carried home and put to bed. But the hypnotizers still refused to relinquish their favorite amusement, and they got Élise Duval once more under the spell, of course with equally distressing results. Then there was an outcry and a scandal, and the *atelier* of M. Gérôme, which, like the studios of many of his eminent colleagues, had been transferred from the Quartier Latin to the neighborhood of Montmartre, was closed for a month, although the real reason for its closure was scarcely divulged.

This happened, if my memory serves me rightly, a little over fifteen years ago, when, I take it, neither *Peter Ibbetson* nor *Trilby* were thought of by Mr. du Maurier,—at any rate not as the hero and heroine of two stories to be written by himself. Unless I am misinformed, the ambition to add the laurels of literature to those of art came late in life to Mr. du Maurier. I do not mean to infer that the *dramatis personæ* of both those novels were not at the time constant and welcome figures haunting his imagination. It is more than probable that they were assiduous though unseen guests by the fireside of an evening after the day's work was done; that they constituted part of the romance of his early manhood, the remembrance of which was sweet. I merely wish to convey my impression that at that period there was no intention to present them to the public.

And yet *Trilby O'Ferrall*, the model of the late 'fifties, and Élise Duval, the model of the late 'seventies and early 'eighties, who for all I know may be exercising her profession still, show a strange, and to me puzzling, physiognomical likeness. I did not read Mr. du Maurier's story in serial form; I have not opened a number of "Harper's Magazine" for two or three years; and though the book was in the house almost as soon as published in England, I did not set eyes on it then. It was only on the 30th of last August that I borrowed the illustrated edition from a library in consequence of the flattering request of the Editor of THE FORUM—to whom I had submitted several subjects—for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an article on "Trilby." The moment I glanced at the portrait of the Irish-Scotch girl in the gray *capote* of the *piou-piou*, with her feet in the roomy slippers, and with her hair combed over her forehead,—a portrait, we must remember, drawn by the author himself,—the moment I glanced at that portrait, I said to myself, "This is a portrait of Élise Duval"; for I had not the faintest idea of the period in which the story was laid. I had not got very far into the book, though, before I found that *Trilby*, if she be not a creature of the author's imagination, —which I am loth to believe,—must have flourished at least a score of years before the well-known model of MM. Gérôme and Constant: hence the likeness remains to all intents and purposes unexplained. That the likeness does exist, and is not a mere fancy on my part, it would not be difficult to prove. I believe, but am not certain, that Élise Duval sat for M. Constant's "Hérodiade" (Herodias) painted about 1880, but there are at least a dozen sketches of her by young men some of whom have since then made a name for themselves. These sketches date from the time when Élise was a frequent visitor at "la Grande Pinte" in the Avenue Trudaine; at Moussau's, next door to it, before Moussau himself removed to the Boulevard du Temple to establish "l'Auberge des Adrets" there; at the old and the new "Chats Noirs," "la Truie qui file," "le Rat Mort," and "l'Abbaye de Thélème,"—all of which establishments are within a stone's throw of the Rue des Martyrs and the Place Pigalle. Many of the great painters had pitched their tents in the neighborhood; their "models in ordinary" followed suit, and the students, when the day's work was done, or even before, came after them. "*Le Quartier Latin a passé les ponts*," said a witty journalist. Nevertheless, the Latin Quarter was not altogether deserted, and on Monday and Thursday nights (the great Bullier nights) the Montmartrais wended their way southward. Élise Duval was of all the parties, for she was festive by nature and *vadrouille jusqu' à la moelle*, just like *Trilby* before the redemption came in her love for *Little Billee*. It would be comparatively easy, then, to find a presentment of Élise Duval.

But such a portrait would only have the effect of substantiating my words; it would not solve the puzzle of the likeness between the two girls. How are we to account for that? The theory that *Trilby* had no existence save in Mr. du Maurier's imagination being dismissed at once, there only remain two others. The first, that long before Mr. du Maurier conceived the idea of writing the life-story of *Trilby O'Ferrall*, he may, during a visit to Paris, have seen Élise Duval in the flesh, or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

her counterpart on paper, and heard of her festive exploits and notably of her hypnotic tribulations. "La grande Lisette," as she was familiarly called, was *une femme à béguins*, which, in the popular acceptation of the word, means two things: she was apt to take sudden and frequent love-fancies; she was never prompted in those fancies by sordid motives. In spite of Mr. du Maurier's laudable attempt to tone down his heroine's "peculiarities" in order to obtain the suffrages of the pure-minded "British Matron" and the "Young Person," it is very evident that the girl whom he had known under the Second Empire, and whom the world now knows as *Trilby O'Ferrall*, was similarly constituted. A score of years or more had passed since Mr. du Maurier had witnessed her joys and sorrows, for I still maintain that she was a living creature once. Is it very surprising, then, that he should have endowed *Trilby* with Élise Duval's physiognomical traits irrespective of the truth of such a resemblance? Nay, the likeness may have been there and have started the idea of writing the story.

The alternative theory, in fact, is based upon the probability of that likeness, of which Mr. du Maurier may have been absolutely ignorant. My surmise of his having seen Élise Duval is a surmise and nothing more, engendered by the causes I have already stated. That we all have our doubles is proved by the hundreds of instances of mistaken identity recorded in criminal and other annals. That the face is the index to the mind and heart has likewise been proved long ago; and the similarity of features and facial outline—perhaps not a startling one originally between the two young girls—may have become more accentuated as time went on, by reason of identity of pursuits, identity of temperament, identity of surroundings and of association, and above all by reason of a like receptivity to hypnotic influences, which alone would show that the physiological and pathological conditions of both girls were pretty much the same.

In the days when *Trilby* flourished, there were certainly a great number of young Englishmen in the Latin Quarter, but I ransack my memory in vain for the living models of Mr. du Maurier's "three musketeers of the brush." No one I knew had the individuality of either *Little Billee*, *Taffy*, or *the Laird*. These three, however, may have disappeared by the time I had the free run of the students' quarter, for I had given my promise not to go thither, unless accompanied by some one much older than myself, until I was twenty, and I kept my word. I may frankly confess that, the moment I got the chance, I made up for my enforced absence. I have had my trials like most

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men, but on the whole my life has not been an unhappy one, yet I look back upon that period of it as the happiest. It is not a question of "youth and apple tarts." I spent an evening in my old haunts during the Easter holidays of this year, in company with a friend of my youth, a Frenchman, and when, at 1.30 A.M. on that or rather the next morning, we recrossed the Pont du Carrousel on our way home, and compared notes, we found that there was more youth left in us—middle-aged men though we are—than in three-fourths of the youngsters of the present Pays Latin. This may be purely a gratifying illusion on our part, but the illusion itself is better than the absence of all illusion, which to my mind marks the present generation of students. We also had our scuffles with the *sergents-de-ville* of those days, and their coadjutors, the National Guard, but they never hurt us and we never hurt them. Within the last half-dozen years I have read of as many free fights between the police and the *jeunesse du quartier*, in which serious bodily damage was done on both sides. And it should be remembered that the *sergot* of the Second Empire was by no means an amiable creature, but he was more discriminating than the *gardien de la paix* of the Third Republic, where the non-criminal classes and the merely nocturnal reveller were concerned. And the jolly, festive youth disarmed his anger by the proposal that he, the *sergent*, should join in the festivities. We proceeded like *Taffy* and *the Laird* on that memorable Christmas evening when *Dodor* and *Zouzou* played at cock-fighting, and the *sergents-de-ville* came to warn them that there was too much noise. Let me interpolate one story out of many to that effect.

Three decades ago the Boulevard Montparnasse was different from what it is now. It was just as wide, but the many substantial dwellings that line its sides to-day had no existence. Still, there were two or three snug *cafés* where the prosperous tradesmen of the neighborhood foregathered for their nightly game of piquet or écarté, and whither we went now and then for the same purpose when the pace had been too strong during the week. One could play uninterruptedly there; in our usual haunts there was too much noise and bustle. At Vallot's or Prével's—I am not quite certain of the spelling—the stakes were confined to the *glorias*, *demi-tasses*, or *mazagrans* of the players; in our usual haunts there were too many young goddesses whose *consommations* had to be finally settled for by the loser,—a serious consideration at the end of the month, or at the end of a week which from the budgetary point of view had been equivalent to three. One night the game

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had been unusually prolonged, and Vallot, who had an inveterate habit of going to bed at two, intimated that "time was up," and nothing would induce him to let us stay to finish the three games, only one of which had been played. The sole concession we could win from him was the loan of the green board and the pack of cards. We were four,—two players and two lookers-on,—and as it was in the middle of June we adjourned to a seat on the Boulevard, under a gas-lamp which we did not want, it being daylight. The game had just been resumed when we heard the tramp of the patrol, and in another moment four men and a corporal of the National Guard[1] appeared in view. "Gentlemen, what are you doing there?" asked the corporal, stepping forward. "We are having a game of écarté, corporal," answered one of the players. "But I cannot allow you to play cards in the public thoroughfare," protested the corporal. "That 's just what I told Vallot when he turned us out in the middle of a game, but that man has n't the faintest respect for the law." The corporal looked somewhat curiously at his interlocutor. It began to dawn on him that the latter was chaffing, but, before the suspicion could grow into a certainty, one of his own men came to our rescue. "Vallot is to blame, corporal," he said; "let them finish their game." It must be remembered that the discipline *supposed* to prevail in the army during the Second Empire was not even attempted to be enforced in the National Guard. "Let them finish their game, corporal," he repeated; "they will not be long." With this, he took his stand behind one of the players; the corporal placed himself behind the other. The other three drew close also. Nevertheless, after a few moments the corporal looked like protesting again, when, just as he was about to open his lips, one of the players said, "I propose." "Would you take cards, corporal?" asked his opponent, holding up his cards. "Certainly," replied the corporal, forgetting all about his duty and dignity. The advice proved fatal; the corporal's client lost the game; the corporal's mettle was up, he began to bet, the wager being eagerly accepted by his men. For an hour or more the contest waged furiously, and then, rather than be interrupted by the wagoners and market-gardeners on their way to the Halles, we all adjourned to the guard-house, which we only left at ten A.M., full of meat and drink which had been procured from an adjacent restaurant, the owner of

[1] In "An Englishman in Paris" (Vol. I, ch. x), there is a sketch of the National Guard in Louis Philippe's time. It would hold good for the civil warriors under the Second Empire.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which was aroused from his slumber to provide them. I am bound to say we were entertained right royally, and when we departed another appointment was made to give *la Garde Nationale* their *revanche*, inasmuch as, apart from the betting of a few, they had been very unlucky.

"Then they played at 'cock-fighting,'" says Mr. du Maurier, recounting the exploits of the joyous company at the studio and proceeding to describe the game. They played at "cock-fighting" everywhere in those days. They played it in the little plots of garden attached to the suburban restaurants; they played it in the studios; they played it at the Imperial residences of Compiègne and St. Cloud; and one day the Empress, sitting alone in the Emperor's apartments, which at the latter palace were on the ground floor, was startled out of her wits by a *cent-garde* rolling in like a ball at the open window which looked upon the private gardens. And an officer, too,—a lieutenant or a sub-lieutenant I forget which,—in his shirt-sleeves and in an altogether undignified position. He had tried to beguile the weary interval between his duties by challenging one of the civil officials, and this was the result. The performance had to be repeated for the delectation of the Empress and her ladies-in-waiting, who often found the time hang heavily on their hands. From that day forth, though, "cock-fighting" was struck from the list of the Imperial Guard's sports and pastimes,—at any rate while they were on duty.

Was it *Zouzou* who thus unceremoniously obtruded on the sovereign's presence? I think not. To begin with, *Zouzou*, when he came into his title and dukedom, got a commission in the *Guides de l'Impératrice*. This, of course, may have been one of Mr. du Maurier's innocent devices to lead his readers off the scent; but from what the author tells us, I doubt if the *Duc de la Rochemartel*, after he and his elder brother had both entered upon a better life, would have been guilty of such frivolities as "cock-fighting." In fact, I doubt whether *Zouzou*, as painted in "Trilby," had any existence at all save in the author's imagination. It is the only figure in the book I am disposed to quarrel with. By his own confession, Mr. du Maurier "has kept his blackguard ducal Zouave for the bouquet of this little show,—the final *bonne bouche* in his bohemian *menu*." Unfortunately, the bouquet is a glaringly artificial one: the *bonne bouche* is no *bonne bouche* to those who know what a *bonne bouche* should be; it is simply the mutton and turnips of Sir Pitt Crawley's bill of fare, and served in an elaborate silver dish and under a French name. A "Rochemartel," and moreover the heir-apparent to a dukedom, for the actual duke in the story has no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

children,—a "Rochemartel," however impecunious, however discredited with his family, however festively inclined, need not have enlisted in a Zouave or other regiment under the Second Empire if willing to rally to the dynasty, even if he had an irresistible vocation for a soldier's life. That *Zouzou* was willing to rally to the Empire was proved subsequently, and, if he was absolutely bent on wearing the Emperor's uniform, a commission would have been found for him by hook or by crook before. His examinations would have been smoothed for him then as they were afterward, for we may take it that *Zouzou* did not gather much knowledge, either theoretical or practical, while with the regiment. "Those people understand nothing of politics," said Napoleon III, referring to the old *noblesse*. "Nor did I want them for that. I only required them for decorative purposes, for they are eminently fit to wear gold lace and I would willingly have gilded them on all their edges."

No improbabilities of a like nature need interfere with one's appreciation of *Dodor*. *M. Rigolot de Lafarce*—the coining of the name smacks somewhat of the process of the very old-fashioned novelist—was a sprig of *la petite noblesse*, and to him and his congeners there was practically but one resource left—the army—after they had spent their inheritance. The very wealthy *commerçant* would, did, and will give his daughter to the penniless bearer of a great historic name, but no second-rate cognomen will satisfy him.[1] *Dodor's* marriage with *Mlle. Passefil* is quite an exception, apart from the fact that *M. Passefil* was merely a shopkeeper, and that *Dodor* himself flung all caste traditions overboard by becoming a retail trader. Under ordinary circumstances *Dodor*, before his enlistment, would not have found an appointment at one hundred francs a month. After he left the army—not before he joined it—he might have found employment in a decorative capacity,—not at court, but in some large drapery establishment. And *Dodor*, not being made of the stuff of which heroes and martyrs of every-day existence are made, would have accepted such an appointment rather than live and die a non-commissioned officer amid the sordid surroundings of a French barracks. The heroic side of such a life was beyond his comprehension. "Our trade is either heroic or ridiculous," said a "Dodor" with a capacity for suffering to me one day. Like Mr. du Maurier's *Dodor* he had "come a cropper," and, after paying all his debts, had about a thousand francs left. He enlisted in a regiment of Spahis.

[1] See Balzac's "Père Goriot"; Augier and Sandeau's "Gendre de M. Poirier"; Alexandre Dumas fils' "Etrangère"; Ohnet's "Serge Panine," etc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lazy by nature, and not very quick at learning, he managed nevertheless to get his sergeant's stripes in a few years, after which he asked to exchange into a dragoon regiment. He never played tricks, and was thoroughly respected and liked by his superiors. Of course he felt his position keenly. "I fancy I am going back to Africa," he remarked during one of my visits. "Perhaps you are right, promotion is quicker there," I replied. "Promotion, promotion," he repeated, with a wan smile; "I have given up all hopes and thoughts of promotion long ago. I might have got my epaulettes if I had set about it earlier; but I wanted so many things, and now it is too late. I am not complaining, only stating a fact. I repeat, our trade is either heroic or ridiculous, there is no middle course. Do people endowed with one grain of common sense risk their lives for the sake of a bit of crimson cloth on their sleeves or a bit of gold piping round their caps. Does it show any sense to practise the hardest and riskiest of trades for a wage which would be indignantly refused by a 'bus-driver. If I were to listen to reason, I should leave the army, promotion in which is beyond hope, and try to get an appointment in a draper's establishment. I have been told that retired soldiers of a certain age can command fair wages to bow to and smile at the lady customers. Talk to me about a position!—that 's what I should call a position: good cheer, comfortable quarters, nothing to do, numerous and charming women to give you the time of day,—an assured provision for one's old age, for one can bow to and smile at ladies while there 's breath left. Hence, there 's everything to induce me to get a situation in a draper's establishment. Unfortunately, I haven't any common sense, and I prefer to die over yonder with a bullet through my brain, if the Almighty will be so good as to let me die in that manner. I prefer to depart this life with the conviction that I have led the noblest life on earth." That was the kind of "Dodor" whom Mr. du Maurier probably never met, so he could not sketch him.

I have outrun my space; nevertheless, I should be loth to finish these pages without referring once more to *Trilby*. She, *Taffy*, *the Laird*, and *Gecko* are, after all, the only figures for whom one cares; for, with all due deference to the memory of *Mr. William Bagot*, he was, in spite of his genius, a bit of a Philistine, and I doubt whether I should have cared to be introduced to his mother and his uncle, the *Rev. Thomas Bagot*. "Es gilt nur ein Glück auf der Erde, das Glück der Liebe, und wer das versäumt, alles versäumt," says Fichte. *Mrs. Bagot* made her son miss the highest joy on earth, the joy of love; and the son was a fool for having missed it. That very respectable, higher-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

middle-class "British matron" was probably not acquainted with the particulars of Raphael Sanzio's life, or she would have known that the immortal pupil of Pietro Vanucci, though a greater genius than her son would ever have been, loved beneath him; that La Fornarina was but a baker's daughter, the contemplation of whose feet set young Sanzio's heart aflame, just as the sight of *Trilby's* feet sowed the first germs of love in *Little Billee's* breast. She would have known that these two were thoroughly happy for eleven years—and eleven years is a large slice out of a man's life so far as his capacity for happiness goes.

La Fornarina was not a model *et tout ce qui s'ensuit; Trilby* was. True, most true; and yet I have an idea that I would sooner have been *Taffy*, ready to marry her with all her imperfections on her head, than *Little Billee*, who, instead of trying to discover her hiding-place, allowed himself to be stricken down with brain-fever. "He could not help that," objects the reader. Yes, he could; the resolution to go after her and bring her back like a man would have kept off the malady. Louis XIV was not much older than *Little Billee* the first time La Vallière fled the Court, driven thence by the intrigues of his mother, his wife, and his sister-in-law. He did not waste time by falling into fits, but tore after her on horseback and brought her back from St. Cloud.

"I only wish to God she'd marry *me!* . . . I can assure you that if *Trilby's* heart were set on me as it is on him, I would gladly cast in my lot with hers for life," said *Taffy*. And *Taffy* would have had no cause to repent, for if Mr. du Maurier's picture is at all like the original, *Trilby* was one in a thousand. One feels sure that the fate of *Coriolis*, as set forth in Goncourt's "Manette Salomon," would have been spared to *Taffy*, for *Michael O'Ferrall's* daughter was not a *Mimi la Salope*, and the heroine of Goncourt's book belonged to that category. I may be utterly mistaken, but I have not been able to divest myself of the suspicion that Mr. du Maurier, after the idea of *Trilby* had taken shape in his mind, got hold of that powerful novel, and that it influenced his *dénouement*. But though he may have read the work, Mr. du Maurier—whose literary career began late in life—was probably not aware that the brothers Goncourt aimed at something more than the writing of a powerful, dramatic story: that "Manette Salomon" was virtually a protest against the invasion of the studios by the Jewish model, and the consequent exclusion of the less pushing Christian damsel.

That invasion began about the time the younger Goncourt was born; that is, almost immediately after the conquest of Algiers—as distinct

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the subsequent conquest of the whole of the Algerian territory. A short while after the French standard had been planted on the Casbah of Algiers, the Jewish model was everywhere,—at Ingres', Horace Vernet's, Delacroix's; and it is but fair to say that in those days she was not only a model, but a counsellor, a collaboratrix. The girl who asked Ingres for his cross of the Legion of Honor, on the plea that she also had contributed something to his success, probably represented the feeling of responsibility of many. Gradually, though, the Parisian Jewess entered the lists. She did not trouble herself to inquire whether she had any aptitude for the task; the occupation was a profitable one in many respects, and that was enough so far as she was concerned. She had little or no artistic instinct, and as for the feeling that caused poor *Trilby's* lapses the Parisian Jewess might have exclaimed with La Fontaine—

"Amour est mort.
En beaux louis se content les fleurettes."

She might have altered the verb, and exclaimed "se comptent," for she never forgot to reckon. "You must wait till you have got the Prix de Rome," said one of those Jewesses to a young painter (at the time I write he is a graybeard and a member of the Institute) in answer to his impassioned pleading—*pas pour le bon motif.* "You must wait till you have the Prix de Rome." The rest of the sentence I leave to the reader's imagination.

Those are the models whom Mr. du Maurier had in view when he brought *Mrs. Bagot* on the scene; and *Little Billee's* mother, if she had heard of models at all, had never heard of any other; she knew not of models "to whom much will be forgiven, for their only sin consisted in having loved too much." Of these was *Trilby O'Ferrall.*

ALBERT D. VANDAM.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDITORSHIP AS A PROFESSION FOR WOMEN.

THE point of view changes from time to time. Up to the middle of the nineteenth century, refined and educated people with traditions of culture at their backs hesitated at allowing a gentlewoman to work for money. She might, indeed, labor under the home roof without stipend, but she must not be known to seek employment, nor permitted to accept a salary. To do this seemed in conservative eyes little short of a disgrace,—in the best of aspects a great misfortune. A woman's husband worked for her support; if she were a spinster, or a widow, she presumably had natural protectors—a father, brothers, kinsmen—on whom she could depend. It would have appeared revolutionary and dangerous to a gentleman of the old school for his daughters to have intimated a desire for a profession, or stooped to the vulgarity of taking wages,—a thing to be condoned only when it could not be helped, as when Divine Providence had assigned to the lady no strong and able-bodied man in duty bound to maintain her in comfort, and, if possible, in luxury. Popularly we accepted the sentiment of our forefathers that woman was a creature to be sheltered, fought for, guarded against rough winds; in a way shut in from the hardships of the world, which it was the province of man to face and vanquish. For her the appropriate sphere of action was within the four walls of her home: nowhere outside of this. The strength of this feeling was, as a matter of course, greatly intensified when a wife was in concern. A wife—her husband living and able to fend for her—had certainly, in the view then almost universally prevailing, neither occasion nor excuse for seeking remunerative occupation beyond, or even within, her own doors.

Until a very recent date, women—at least by courtesy—constituted our only recognized aristocracy; and though in individual cases, and where for any reason deep and depressing poverty existed, this privileged portion of society might be called upon to endure want and suffering, still, as a rule, women queened it everywhere. From one end of the land to the other, in public conveyances, at wayside inns, on the crowded city thoroughfare, or along the obscure country road,—one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had but to need it, and the uttermost of man's resources in strength, civility, and brotherly kindness was laid at a woman's feet. The cavalier brusqueness, the indifference which ignores and the rudeness which offends her in her travels about town on elevated railways and across that field of prowess, the Brooklyn Bridge, though accepted without protest or demur by the *fin de siècle* woman, would have been an amazement and an indignation to her predecessors forty years ago. In the hot competitions of our period we have lost something very precious and very beautiful in the decline of reverence once general in the relations between men and women as members of the community; yet that we have gained a counterbalancing good, which we would be reluctant to lose, must be gratefully conceded.

In days now dream-like and misty to us who are older, and quite undreamed of by the recent graduates of our woman's colleges, the woman who had to support herself alone, or herself and her widowed mother, or herself and the brothers who must be prepared for life, or, again, herself and her fatherless children,—the woman of good family and liberal education, on whom so great a burden fell, might choose between several lines of employment. She might teach: a teacher lost no caste. In most cases she did teach, whether or not she possessed fitness for the work, going out as a governess, establishing a school, or seeking pupils in whatever branch of *belles lettres* or graceful accomplishments she had at her tongue's or her fingers' end. She might sew: in a period not yet remote, most women were taught hand-sewing, and many acquired proficiency in the art; the little shining needle is still woman's ready tool, a lady's art of hem-stitching and embroidery availing at need in some localities to keep the wolf from the door. Besides teaching and sewing, a woman could, if she were endowed with the faculty, make a success of keeping a boarding-house, her feminine gifts enabling her so to expand her house that it grew into a home for the stranger within her gates. These three professions—those of the teacher, the seamstress, and the housekeeper—bounded opportunity for women while yet the dawn was nebulous of a day quickening with splendid possibilities. It is trite to say that our hedges are now broken down, and all paths for which woman longs are open to her, pioneered by brave spirits who went before, dared ridicule, breasted antagonism, defied repulse, and conquered the situation. Ours is another era. We have changed the point of view.

The mental discipline and thorough training of the woman's college, wherever found, whatever its name, fits its student, not only for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

home life and its exigencies, but, as never before, enables her to enter the ranks of the self-supporting. She steps into the market on equal terms with those she meets there; and so far is public opinion from condemning the self-supporting woman, that she is held in high esteem. Everywhere she finds warm and cordial greeting, and, if not gallantry, comradeship, which is better; and what rôle soever she undertakes, it is demanded of her only that she fill it with ability. Indeed there are few rôles which woman may not and does not now attempt; no bar remains to exclude her from any trade, business, or profession for which she has a bias or an ambition. A fair field and no favor is all she asks, and this is ungrudgingly granted. Day by day her opportunities increase, as her understanding of life and her wish to share in its battles and prizes grows more emphatic. The single woman to-day, young, strong, and educated, who is willing to lean on a relative, doing nothing for herself, is justly regarded with contempt by other women. A wife often supplements the family purse by her own exertions, and is honored in doing so. Women are doctors, ministers, lawyers, college presidents, and journalists. In the latter calling their number is already legion. Every great newspaper has its corps of woman editors and reporters. Each syndicate has its department controlled by a woman. In many of the smaller towns woman's deft hand is at the helm in the local journal. Women are numerically a host in the army of readers. They are a host in the army of writers as well. The point of view has changed.

Editorship presents a most inviting opportunity to the woman who dares to undertake its duties and fulfil its arduous exactions. Strenuous in obligation, unremitting in requirement, peremptory in the task-master-taking of tolls from body and mind, bristling with difficulties, and beset with drudgeries, it nevertheless repays the worker in multiplied measure. The qualities inherited from generations of grandmothers and great-grandmothers who were proficient in housekeeping and sewing and teaching, and who to these added a royal acceptance of homage, stand the modern woman editor firmly in stead when she enters upon her kingdom. In truth it is a kingdom worth ruling, though its simple motto must ever be the trenchant one, "I serve."

Invincible patience, continual attention to details, tireless self-sacrifice, an intuitive vicarious consciousness, power of synthesis, power of analysis, tranquil impartiality, keen discrimination, a habit of surveying both sides of a question,—are indispensable parts of a woman editor's outfit for her position. She must put herself in another's place. She

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must also inexorably hold her own. With gentleness, suavity, and tact she must learn to say No as if she were saying Yes,—so graciously that the denied shall be conciliated. She must have the courage of her opinions, particularly when some transient accident lifts into prominence and passion themes which are not vital, or that cannot be settled by sudden acclamation. Many questions arise which are enthusiastically pressed and urged on the public by a few interested persons, until a flame of apparent zeal blazes furiously. The real plain public, on whom we fall back for ultimate settlements of questions affecting the weal of all, are not stirred. The editor must know how to act in such a crisis,—must, above everything, be true to what she deems the highest good.

The personality of the woman seeking editorship, if not winning, should at least be impressive. She must needs be intellectual, receptive, alert, sympathetic; in touch with issues of current thought and action, and with drifts of current enterprise and discovery. As for her body, it must fitly sheathe so vital and so dominant a soul. Steel and india-rubber are not too strong or too flexible for the physical make-up of the woman in this case, who, if she would not wear out prematurely, must also know how to rest and when to rest, and what to gain by recreation and exercise.

Aside from direct training for her work, the woman editor, as further preliminary preparation, needs acquaintance with society; some elementary knowledge of the technique of art, and the peculiarities of different schools; an easy familiarity with artists by name and by the more important of their works; and an extensive, fully assimilated knowledge of books. One cannot hope to cram or to coach, as in other competitive examinations, for the equipment which an editor's chair imperatively asks as requisite and essential. One must have lived and breathed and had her being in that hushed and cloistered world where the great masters in art and literature forever sit, laurel-crowned and austere. Nor can she neglect the favorites of the passing moment. She must be aware of what is going on in the contemporaneous field, and know the present-day writers and their books. All literature—good, bad, and indifferent—must be as an open book to the editor, not so much that she may not stumble into the trap of the occasional plagiarist, as that she may be able at a look or a touch to discriminate between the respective claims of wares offered for her acceptance, and that she may be readily responsive to the cry for bread of the people who come to her table. Purveyor of food for the hungry, she cannot

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

provide as she ought, if she have not gone forth into all gardens. She must possess a certain catholicity of taste, and, singularly, must often distrust at first sight what makes its strongest individual appeal to her personally, since editorship implies vicariousness. Her feeling of what is false and what is true marches side by side with her feeling of what she owes to her readers and what they are to receive at her hands. An editor is, in one bundle, doctor, mother, friend, counsellor, physician, comrade, companion, and consoler,—so many strands are woven together in her comprehensive work. No other thing made by man is so vital as a book (or a newspaper, which is next to a book), and no other profession requires of its followers severer tests or more single-hearted devotion in its many-sided equipment.

It goes without saying that no human being—even if able, like Macaulay, to absorb the printed page through the pores of the skin—can hope to read everything; but a wide and tolerant study of literature in various departments gives the editor a wonderful advantage, not unlike second-sight, so that she is not merely seldom deceived by pretenders, but equally that she is able to recognize the best on the instant that it is presented to her notice. A genuine feeling for literature makes her an expert.

The steps toward editorship are usually—not invariably, but usually—those of gradual ascent. The editor must serve an apprenticeship, and learn the secrets of her profession little by little. The most convenient—and upon the whole the most approved—school for journalism is afforded by the daily and weekly press. A bright, wide-awake girl, fresh from her four years at college, modestly enters the office of a newspaper, and sets her feet firmly on the first round of the ladder when she undertakes her earliest assignment as a reporter. At this stage of her career the novice must expect peculiar and sometimes disagreeable experiences. She goes where she is sent; she writes what she sees; she learns concentration, swiftness, and condensation. With perfect amiability she submits to take the elisions and additions of her superior's blue pencil; her greatest gain was made when, in the spirit of the soldier, she accepted the fact that she had a superior in office and that obedience was a necessity of the case. Undisciplined natures are predestined to failure. The girl learns to subordinate her personal wishes to the imperious demands of her paper. Whatever she does, she does with her whole heart and in the best possible way. By degrees she is entrusted more and more with important engagements, on the principle, old as human nature, that to him that hath shall be given.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If she is one of the staff of a suburban paper, or has the rare good fortune to belong to that of a literary, household, or religious periodical, she may be permitted to specialize. She reviews books; she is responsible for the social column; she writes dramatic criticism; bit by bit she arrives at the pleasant eminence of the home, or the children's, or the woman's department. Here her abilities and talents have a chance for development: her individuality tells; she enjoys the distinction of editing, apart from the agreeable zest of contributing and the comparative drudgery of reporting to order. She has much responsibility, much toil, but also a delightful sense of power. Her chance has come.

It is always well for the woman editor, if she can, to have a special line, within the limits of which she may broaden out, and where she can, so to speak, focus her talents and efforts. For most women nothing is so attractive as the opportunity to do this in the departments of the periodical press which appeal to motherhood in its thousand interests, and to housekeeping, home-making, and the entertainment and instruction of children. But women are by no means confined to these themes and to a world so exclusively feminine as these contemplate. There are enthusiastic students of political economy, of social science, of applied hygiene, of finance, among women as among men, and these find scope for their talents in the various publications devoted to particular branches of learning, or to ramifications of business or trade. A journal of mining and engineering is successfully edited by a gifted woman whose tastes and pursuits, as well as her uncommon linguistic attainments, have given her marked ability for so difficult and unique a position. Women, applying themselves to any definite and dignified line of study, can and do become thoroughly equipped and qualified to conduct journals devoted to its elucidation. Yet the wide field for the occupation of the woman editor remains not in such well-worn avenues as politics and science may offer, but rather on her natural ground of vantage, covering everything which nearly or remotely affects the home. Hence, the fashion journalists find congenial occupation in the conduct of departments and publications relating to clothes. Clothing and human progress are almost synonymous terms; and it is beneath no one to chronicle the passing styles, to indicate what may and may not be the attire of men and women in a high state of civilization, to give a thoughtful glance toward fabrics, materials, new inventions, the beauty of shape, the charm of color, the grace of elegance, which show the line of demarcation between us and savagery and make of society a splendid moving pageant. Women are especially successful as fashion-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

editors, and it is not too much to hope that in future they may be more decidedly helpful here than has hitherto been practicable, demonstrating that there is no divorce between the healthful and the beautiful styles of dress, uplifting common sense to a fine art.

The woman's department—a conspicuous feature in most of our journals—shows that thoughtful and temperate editors are awake to the needs of the hour, and that a talent for administration counts on the credit side of the sheet, let us find it where we may.

Among the duties of the woman-editor's position are some not unlike those of the general who judiciously plans a campaign. The clamor for novelty, for the modern, for what will please, for what will win and hold subscribers, without whom the publication will presently find itself bankrupt,—this clamor is, and properly, ever in her ears. She must both defer to and educate her public. Not led away by a transient craze for the merely sensational, she must determine to what degree her readers crave the personal, often impertinent, and, it must be confessed, purely trivial and silly details about people of no moment, which so often slip into type. Looking over the field with clear eyes, she must select from the ranks of well-known and popular writers those whose work ensures them a hearing. Novelists, essayists, writers of short stories, poets, specialists in this or the other department, have their claim on her attention. Mapping out her paper for the year, or the month, or the week, she cannot leave anything to haphazard; all must be wisely and intelligently arranged, with a view to the central purpose, the key-note of her journal; with a look, too, toward the interests of her readers, and a far-seeing, all-comprehending thought of the well-being of her paper as part of the machinery of the age.

The judicious woman editor has a cordial and sincere welcome for that well-beloved of all the corps editorial, the new writer. The disappointed contributor—whose manuscript, sent out to the tender mercies of the world with so many hopes, duly returns, declined with thanks—is apt to be doubtful of this. It has been explained over and over that the editor's regret at the rejection of an article is not perfunctory, a *façon de parler*, but is real and profound to the heart's core; yet contributors are seldom convinced; they seldom believe that the editor could not have accepted their offerings had he or she chosen to do so: they are frequently hurt and grieved, if not angry and vindictive, over their rejection. Their jealousy of those who have attained to what they envy is untempered by any true appreciation of the situation, which is simply this, that in all editorial offices the supply of admirable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

material voluntarily offered far exceeds the demand, and far transcends the available limits of space. Periodicals appear with recurrent regularity at fixed intervals; each includes within its covers a definite number of pages; each page holds only so many columns and so many words. The editor must use his or her best judgment in filling this inelastic space, must act with strictly impersonal and impartial discretion in ordering, selecting, accepting, and declining manuscripts. It is a red-letter day indeed when the name hitherto unknown drifts into hailing distance, and it is the editor's privilege to introduce to contemporaneous literature another author whose stories are to achieve popularity. Great, then, is the editor's complacency, full and thrilling her joy,—akin to that of the happy girl who places her betrothed hand in that of her lover; of the groom when he kisses his bride at the altar; of the explorer when he sets his foot on the virgin soil of a never-before-discovered continent. Such joys, alas! come but seldom. The editor's normal condition is that of Tantalus; to her the hope of this new and delightful contributor is a possibility ever near, but ever receding, often coming so close that she all but grasps it, then dissolving into thinnest air.

The emoluments of editorial work for women have very inelastic limits. The editor whose position brings her $5,000 a year in salary may be said to have achieved the highest financial success attainable under existing conditions. From $2,500 to $3,000 per year are salaries more generally paid than the amount above stated, and $50 or $60 a week is a usual, and is considered by most women a generous, wage for continuous and exhausting work, taxing every power they possess. From $15 to $40 a week are received by women for the conduct of special departments. This, as a rule, presupposes daily attendance at an office during office hours, which are usually from 9.30 A.M. to 4 or 5 P.M. The daily wear and tear on nerves, temper, and clothing, of obligatory office attendance, cannot be adequately stated or paid for in dollars and cents, and therefore a woman must love her profession over and above financial gains, and pursue it for its own sake, if she would find in it the rewards of a chosen career.

Among women whose marked success in editorship makes them fairly representative, a few names among many may be selected without impropriety. Mary Mapes Dodge, of "St. Nicholas"; Jeannette L. Gilder, of the "Critic"; Mrs. Nicholson, of the New Orleans "Picayune"; Mary H. Krout, of the Chicago "Inter-Ocean"; Mrs. J. C. Croly, Helen S. Conant, Ellen Hutchinson, Margaret Hamilton

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Welch, Elizabeth G. Jordan, Lillian W. Betts, Frances J. Dyer, Helen M. Winslow, Clara Laughlin, Eliza Heaton,—all of them women editing magazines, or departments in established journals,—are good examples of ability and versatility. From so brief a list many honored names must be omitted; but one must be starred,—that of the late Mary Louise Booth, for twenty-two years the editor of "Harper's Bazar."

The mistake oftenest made by the woman who adopts editorship as a profession is in making no adequate concession to her sex. "I will do my work like a man," she exclaims, proceeding to trample down certain needs of her nature, based on organic law, and never intended to be outraged. Few women can work as relentlessly and with as sternly rigid endeavor as most men may safely do. Nature indicates that woman must observe the law of her being, recognizing her right to, and her need of, the soft pedal now and then. Regulating her exertions judiciously, she will do as good work and as much work in the long run as will man. She cannot do it in precisely the same way, nor should she do violence to her sex by the attempt. The woman who will longest live to do her work will be she who responds intelligently to the voice of God as she hears it in the rhythmic ebb and flow of the blood in her veins, and obeys the word there spoken. No woman can with safety work all day long in an office, and give evening after evening to society, to the theatre, or to delightful but over-stimulating clubs, where she must read and discuss papers and chat with bright women to whom the club is simply an incident in a pleasant but not rigid ordinary life. Something must be resigned. She must deny herself many social pleasures and innocent recreations, letting her work take precedence of everything else in the order of importance.

When vacations are few and far between, the careful worker may save her nerve force in many ways. She needs the best food, served well and in abundance. The background of her life should be agreeable; of all women she requires a pleasant home, with the relief and freedom to be secured only under one's own roof. Whether her home be in a hotel, in a boarding-house, or in some independent shelter where she keeps house, the woman editor must have a port to put into for repairs. This is as essential to her as the business man's home is to him. A bright, well-ordered home makes one over for to-morrow, however weary may have been to-day. Leaving her office, the editor should shake off its dust from her feet at its threshold; or, if her work be largely done at home and in her own study, when the hours for work are over she should drop every care. Plans, contribu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tors, manuscripts, proof, correspondence, perplexities, should be forgotten until the time returns for their legitimate reappearance. Only by accustoming herself to this entire relief from work when work-hours are over can the editor retain her tranquil poise and her mental freshness.

Physical culture is so exact a science that few people fail to know some of its shibboleths. "Relax," "repose," "recreate," are words reiterated by the wise, and patent in their meaning to the dullest. Exercise is also a golden prescription. The right kind of exercise at the right time wonderfully tones the system and sets in motion the forces that repair waste. The Turkish bath and massage are magical aids in keeping the worker's health and vitality at high-water mark. When well and strong, care does not press heavily, and weights can be lightly carried.

The woman editor should acquire the art of accepting interruptions without dismay and without irritation. One may learn to side-track the subject on which she is employed so that the editorial, the letter, the prospectus, or whatever may be the task on hand, may be quickly slipped aside, while she receives the caller, discusses the new proposition, or decides on one of the dozen suggestions made to her in a day by her publisher, her fellow editors, or her prized contributors. She must govern her mind as absolutely as the helm governs the ship, or the hand on the rein controls the mettlesome horse; it is a question of habit, of will, of concentration.

Executive ability and a talent for administration are as characteristic of the woman editor as of the woman who presides over a college or a mansion. One must have system; but it must be an elastic system,—a servant and not a master to her who owns it. Not to fuss nor to fidget, nor to be easily perturbed; not to take an occasional blunder too much to heart; not to be unduly elated over an occasional triumph,—are the dictates of sound policy. An equal pulse, a quiet step, a gentle manner, one's powers at command, one's soul at peace, one's body comfortably well,—and the woman who has entered on the profession of editorship may enjoy every moment of her useful life.

There come to women in due course long and pleasant years when the heyday of youth has passed, and they have arrived at the tranquil Indian summer of their lives. Theirs is now the knowledge of men and women and of affairs patent only to experience. They know the world; its shadows and its lights have been their own. Sorrow has wrought its work upon their hearts, joy has given them its sweetest draughts. They are sympathetic with youth, for they have trained and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

guided it; with age, for they see it on the westering side of the hill to the top of which they have climbed. The physician assures such women that they are able to undertake work and carry responsibilities which at an earlier period would have been fraught with imminent perils had they then essayed them. At this stage they are freed from claims which were once relentless; their world does not need them as it used to. Granting to these women of mellow nature a ripened culture and a rich experience; to these gracious women of middle age a literary taste, a wise judgment, and a facile pen,—what can be at once more inviting and more appropriate than the career offered in editorship? Where, as in several instances, editorial chairs are filled by women, able, serene, strong, and sanguine, though no longer young except as youth abides in the heart, the result is a demonstration that of the liberal professions this, at least, puts no ban upon maturity. The office is to be filled, and may be as acceptably filled by the older as by the younger aspirant. She may bring to it gifts and graces which are the sheaves with which time has filled her arms; she will find in its engrossing but congenial occupations a defence against *ennui*, and the sense, always grateful, that she is paying in full her debt not only to her generation, but also to the century.

MARGARET E. SANGSTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MONROE DOCTRINE: DEFENCE, NOT DEFIANCE.

In a number of international questions which have confronted our State Department within the past few years, in which the United States and other American nations have been interested, what is known as the "Monroe doctrine" has been appealed to by a large class of statesmen and newspapers as being a statement of the settled policy of the United States as to the ownership and occupation of the territory of the Western continents. In the controversy with England some months ago as to the collection of an indemnity from one of the Central American states, the columns of our papers and the speeches of our orators were full of intimations that the Monroe doctrine was being sadly neglected. In the present Venezuelan question we are assured from time to time, by a part of the press, that we may look for a speedy enforcement of that doctrine; while another part bewails the neglect which has befallen it. Many of the platforms of our political parties, both Democratic and Republican, have during the past few years contained declarations of approval of the Monroe doctrine. Speakers of national reputation have attracted wide attention by dwelling upon the question, whether or not the present Administration proposes to maintain and assert that doctrine, and have declared that the United States should stand ready, with army, navy, and treasury, to uphold it. Its maintenance has been said to be a necessary part of a "vigorous foreign policy," and Administrations which have been suspected of only a mild enthusiasm in its favor have been called unAmerican and unpatriotic.

Now it is manifest that a political principle or doctrine which receives so much attention and awakens so much feeling cannot be safely misunderstood. A doctrine which may require the whole army and navy and treasury of the country to uphold it, and which furnishes the key-note of our relations with powerful foreign governments on questions relating to the American continents, merits the closest study as to its origin, its exact meaning and limitations, its binding force, and its wisdom.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

First, as to its origin: The Monroe doctrine is the collective term applied to two declarations contained in the Message of President Monroe to the Congress of the United States, December 2, 1823. The two declarations are to be found in different portions of the Message, and are made with reference to different subject-matters; the history of one is different from that of the other, and the general principles suggested by the two refer to entirely different subjects. I will consider them separately. The first declaration is as follows:

"At the proposal of the Russian Imperial Government, made through the Minister of the Emperor residing here, a full power and instructions have been transmitted to the Minister of the United States at St. Petersburg, to arrange, by amicable negotiation, the respective rights and interests of the two nations on the Northwest coast of this continent. A similar proposal has been made by His Imperial Majesty to the Government of Great Britain, which has likewise been acceded to. The Government of the United States has been desirous, by this friendly proceeding, of manifesting the great value which they have in variably attached to the friendship of the Emperor, and their solicitude to cultivate the best understanding with his Government. In the discussions to which this interest has given rise, and in the arrangements by which they may terminate, the occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers."

The facts that made the occasion "proper for asserting" this principle are these. The only European powers on the northern continent at this time were Russia and Great Britain. Mexico and Central America had attained their independence, and Spain had ceded to the United States all its territory in what is now the Northwest portion of the United States. The boundaries of the respective territories of the United States, Great Britain, and Russia were not clearly defined; but since the year 1818, under a treaty made in that year, Great Britain and the United States had jointly occupied the land claimed by each in the Northwest coast. Any discussion between the United States and Great Britain, therefore, as to their common boundary, was postponed for a time. In 1821 an imperial ukase of the Czar asserted the title of Russia to that portion of the continent extending from the extreme northwest point southward to the fifty-first parallel, which included about half of what is now known as the Dominion of Canada. Great Britain and the United States—especially the former—were strongly opposed to this claim of the Czar's, and they united in opposition to it. At the time of which we speak, John Quincy Adams was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our Secretary of State; Mr. Rush was Minister to England; Mr. Middleton was Minister to Russia; and Baron Tuyl was the Russian Minister to the United States. It was the common desire of the three great Powers involved, that the boundary question should be settled, and the United States empowered Mr. Middleton to act in negotiations leading to that settlement. In the month of July instructions were forwarded to him as to the attitude of the United States on the questions at issue. On July 17, 1823, Baron Tuyl inquired of Mr. Adams what would be the purport of the instructions to be forwarded to our representative at St. Petersburg. Mr. Adams writes:

"I told him specially that we should contest the right of Russia to *any* territorial establishment on this continent, and that we should assume distinctly the principle that the American continents are no longer subjects for *any* new European colonial establishments." (Diary, Vol. 6, p. 163.)

Instructions were forwarded to Mr. Middleton through Mr. Rush at London. The latter was instructed to submit them to the British Government for their opinion. In a letter from Mr. Adams to Mr. Rush accompanying these instructions, the whole subject is discussed very fully. Mr. Adams writes that Spain has ceased to have any portion of the American continent. He refers to the burdens of the European colonial systems in America, contends that the entire continent is closed against the establishment, by any European power, of any such colonial settlements hereafter in any place not now under actual occupation, for the reason that the entire continent is now occupied by sovereign nations. He says:

"The necessary consequence of this state of things will be, that the American continents henceforth will no longer be subject to colonization. Occupied by sovereign nations, they will be accessible to Europeans and each other on that footing alone."

This was the substance of the instructions to the American Minister at St. Petersburg, and this was the question and the state of facts to which President Monroe referred when he said:

"In the discussions to which this interest has given rise, and in the arrangements by which they may terminate, the occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers."

It should be remembered that for three centuries before the date of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this declaration, the European nations had been planting colonies on the American continents. The continents were, at the time of their discovery by the Old World, considered to be in a state of nature, under the dominion and title of no civilized government or people. The European nations, therefore, had a right to plant colonies in any portion of the New World to which they could acquire title by discovery or prior occupation. They availed themselves of this opportunity, and emigrants went from all the leading countries of Europe to the New World. English emigrants settled at Plymouth and Jamestown; the French took possession of the St. Lawrence and a part of the territory surrounding the Great Lakes; Spain established colonies in the land of the Aztecs: and they all took title to the territory thus occupied, not by conveyance from some other sovereignty, and not by conquest from any civilized people, but by virtue of their discovery or prior occupation. This is the process to which the term "colonization" is applied, and to which President Monroe refers in his Message. Colonization could continue as long as there remained any portion of the American continents which had not been appropriated by some sovereign nation or its representatives; but when the titles of the nations occupying the continents cover every foot of land thereon, then colonization must cease. In 1823 that time had come, and when President Monroe said that the American continents are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization, he was simply stating the geographical fact that they were already occupied. This was the view taken of it in 1848 by Mr. Calhoun, who had been a member of Mr. Monroe's Cabinet to which the Message had been referred; and the context of the Message, and the state of facts which gave rise to it, exclude any wider view of the President's meaning.

It is to be observed, also, that there is no intimation connected with the statement of this geographical fact as to what the United States would do in the event of the refusal of a European power to take the same view of the subject. This language of the President did not commit himself or his Administration to any particular course of action in such an event. At any rate, it has for a long time been recognized by all nations that the territory of the American continents is wholly "occupied by sovereign nations, and that they will be accessible to Europeans and each other on that footing alone." We may safely say, therefore, that the occasion for the assertion of that fact or principle has passed away, and in our dealings with foreign nations we shall hereafter have no occasion to refer to it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But in the Message there is another declaration by the President, as to the relation of foreign powers to the American continents. The facts which gave rise to it are these:

Upon the downfall of Napoleon, as every student of history knows, an alliance of European powers was formed, and became known as the Holy Alliance, composed of Russia, Prussia, Austria, and France. The objects of this Alliance were, among others, to sustain and extend monarchical principles as far as possible, and especially to restore to their thrones the legitimate monarchs who had been deposed by Napoleon, or by their own subjects under the influence of the principles of the French Revolution. This was a powerful Alliance, and accomcomplished much in the directions indicated. In fact, Europe was thoroughly reactionary at this time. Public constitutions had been subverted, and the people oppressed; Bourbon rule was fully restored. At this point the Holy Alliance turned its attention to the New World. The Spanish-American states had successfully revolted from Spain, and were now in existence as independent governments. The Holy Alliance proposed to extend its operations to this continent, and to restore Ferdinand to his revolted states. England was not a member of the Holy Alliance, but was favorable to its general principles and policy. To this particular venture, however, she was very much opposed. The general principles of the Holy Alliance were in harmony with the monarchical institutions and ideas of Great Britain, but the possession of Central America by Spain, or by any other European country, would have been injurious to the commercial interests of Great Britain. This, and other considerations in the same direction of greater or less importance, prevailed, and England came out in open opposition to the scheme of the Holy Alliance. She sought to enlist the sympathy and coöperation of the United States, whose Government was naturally very much interested in the question. As a republic, it could not view, except with great displeasure, the extension of the reactionary movement to this continent and so great was the power of the Alliance that the United States, then a young nation and a pioneer in free government, was not entirely free from the fear that the Alliance would ultimately extend its interference to ourselves. For this reason the attitude of England was viewed with great public approval in this country; and while the United States Government did not act on the subject in the manner proposed by England, yet the President, with the advice and approval of his Cabinet, took the position that the United States would not approve of the extension of the operations of the Holy Alliance to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this continent. The same Message from which we have heretofore quoted contained the following language:

"In the wars of the European Powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced, that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defence. With the movements in this hemisphere we are, of necessity, more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the Allied Powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments. And to the defence of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, the whole nation is devoted. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those Powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European Power we have not interfered and shall not interfere; but with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European Power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States."

There are three points to be noted in this declaration of the President:

First. It is the attempt on the part of the Allies to extend their system to this hemisphere, and their interposition in the affairs of the Central American states for the purpose of oppressing them, which the President says the United States would regard as dangerous to her peace and safety, and as being the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States. No reference was made to the mere acquisition of territory or dominion on this continent by the Allies, or by any one of them. The Allies were not seeking territorial acquisitions. They were proposing to overthrow the republican governments which had been established in Central America, and to substitute for them the crown of Ferdinand,—this as a part merely of a general crusade against republican governments the world over. The popular understanding of the President's Message at the time it was written strengthens, if possible, the position that it was the subversion of the liberties of the American States, and the establishment of monarchies in their stead,—and not the acquisition of American territory,—to which the Message referred. A member of Mr. Monroe's family, writing to him on December 6, 1823, just after the Message was published, said:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"You will have the merit of proposing an enlightened system of policy which promises to secure the united liberties of the New World, and to counteract the deep-laid schemes in the Old for the establishment of a universal despotism."

Second. The underlying principle in this declaration was not sentiment, but self-defence. The occupation of any portion of the North American continent by an alliance of foreign Powers engaged in the business of overthrowing republics would be—in view of the youth and comparative weakness of our own nation—a standing menace to our own safety. Daniel Webster, in a speech delivered in the year 1826, with reference to this declaration, said:

"It is doubtless true, as I took occasion to observe the other day, that this declaration must be considered as founded on our rights, and to spring mainly from a regard to their preservation. It did not commit us, at all events, to take up arms on any indication of hostile feeling by the Powers of Europe towards South America. If, for example, all the states of Europe had refused to trade with South America until her states should return to their former allegiance, that would have furnished no cause of interference to us. Or if an armament had been furnished by the Allies to act against provinces the most remote from us, as Chili or Buenos Ayres, the distance of the scene of action diminishing our apprehension of danger, and diminishing also our means of effectual interposition, might still have left us to content ourselves with remonstrance. But a different case would have arisen if an army, equipped and maintained by these Powers, had been landed on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico, and commenced the war in our own immediate neighborhood. Such an event might justly be regarded as dangerous to ourselves, and, on that ground, call for decided and immediate interference by us. The sentiments and the policy announced by the declaration, thus understood, were therefore in strict conformity to our duties and our interest."

Third. The declaration of the President does not contain a definite statement of the action which would be taken by the United States in the event of the scheme of the Holy Alliance being carried out. He says that the prosecution of such an enterprise would be dangerous to our peace and safety, and would be the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States. But there are many ways of treating a "manifestation of an unfriendly disposition." It may be ignored, or it may provoke a mere protest, or it may result in war,—depending upon circumstances. The President's language, therefore, did not commit his Administration to any particular course of action, but left it free to act as circumstances might require or permit.

Briefly stated, therefore, the declaration meant that the United States would consider as perilous and unfriendly to it an attempt on the part of the Holy Alliance, engaged in a crusade against free government, to extend its operations to this continent; and that,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

viewing the attempt in such a light, it would act as circumstances should demand. The meaning of the language cannot be extended so as to commit the United States to interfere against the mere acquisition of American soil by a European nation through either purchase or conquest.

The Holy Alliance expired long ago, and its work has been undone by the European revolutions which have occurred since that time. Constitutional government is in the ascendency to-day in the very capitals where the schemes of the Holy Alliance were formed, and reaction is hardly possible. Absolutism cannot hold its own in the land of its birth, much less extend its power to the American continents. Yet it is only to such an attempted extension that the Monroe doctrine refers. It follows, therefore, that the time has passed when that doctrine furnishes a guide for the settlement of any question of foreign policy which actually confronts our government.

It is not here contended that a foreign government should be allowed to acquire a foot of American soil; that Great Britain should be allowed to collect any indemnity from Nicaragua, or to extend her boundaries in Venezuela. But whatever course the United States may take in these matters, it cannot pretend to be guided by the Monroe doctrine, for that doctrine relates to wholly different matters, and is of no more value as a rule for the decision of these questions than the doctrine of the eternal damnation of non-elect infants. Further, the Monroe doctrine as thus understood does not to-day suggest a "vigorous foreign policy." Its application meant a vigorous foreign policy in 1823, when it was promulgated; but a foreign policy which to-day depends for its vigor upon the application of this doctrine would be a very weak policy, for there is no state of affairs at present existing to which the Monroe doctrine could be applied. The political candidate or party declaring his or its adherence to that doctrine upholds a policy the occasion for which long ago disappeared, and is likely never to occur again.

One word as to the legal status of the doctrine. It was a statement of the opinion of the President upon a matter of foreign policy, given to Congress in pursuance of his constitutional duty to "give to Congress information of the state of the Union, and to recommend to its consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." It was within the power of Congress alone—the legislative branch of the Government—to adopt for the United States the policy thus recommended by the President. Congress might have taken a directly oppo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

site course, and in such an event the opinion of Congress, and not that of the President, would have guided the policy of the country. In fact, a resolution introduced by Mr. Clay in the House of Representatives at the session during which this Message was sent, and which was intended to commit the House of Representatives to the sentiments contained in the Message, was quietly ignored. Even if Congress had been in accord with the President in the matter, the doctrine would not have had the force of a precedent—sufficiently binding to commit the United States to the same policy at any future time—so long as no occasion had arisen for carrying it into effect, and the United States had not actually done so. The declaration was simply a proposition, by the President to Congress, of a policy which Congress never adopted, and which the country did not act upon. It was a popular sentiment expressed by a popular President, and nothing more.

It would be interesting to review the debates and the action of Congress in the Panama and Yucatan questions, for the light which they throw on the attitude of Congress to the Monroe doctrine; the action of the United States with reference to the ill-fated expedition of Maximilian into Mexico is, for the same reason, interesting in this connection: but my space will not permit such a review. It is sufficient to say that a study of these events will confirm the soundness of the position here taken,—that the Monroe doctrine was intended to apply to a state of facts which no longer exists, and that it cannot to-day have *any* influence upon the policy of the United States towards the remainder of the American continents, much less the potent and far-reaching influence which is claimed for it by many writers and speakers.

ALFRED C. CASSATT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THOMAS CARLYLE: HIS WORK AND INFLUENCE.

Dr. Samuel Johnson, during a long life, cherished an aversion, Platonic rather than militant, for Scotland and the Scotch. Had any one told him that out of the land where oats were fed to men there should issue soon after his death a master of romance, an incomparable singer, and a historian without rival, we can well imagine the emphasis with which he would have said, "Sir, that is impossible!" Nevertheless, for the best part of a century, Scotland has shed her influence through the world in the genius of Walter Scott, Robert Burns, and Thomas Carlyle; and she has taken sweet vengeance on the burly Doctor himself, by creating in James Boswell not only the best of British biographers, but one so far the best that no other can be named worthy to stand second to him. We now celebrate the centenary of the last of these great Scotchmen,—Thomas Carlyle,—and it is fitting that we should survey his life and work.

In a time like our own, when literature on either side of the Atlantic lacks original energy; when the best minds are busy with criticism rather than with creation; when ephemeral story-tellers and spineless disciples of culture pass for masters, and sincere but uninspired scholars have our respect but move us not,—we shall do well to contemplate anew the man who by his personality and his books has nobly swayed two generations of the English-speaking race, and who, as the years recede, looms more and more certainly as the foremost modern British man of letters. Men may look distorted to their contemporaries, like the figures in a Chinese picture; but Time, the wisest of painters, sets them in their true perspective, gives them their just proportions, and reveals their permanent features in light and shade. And sufficient time has now elapsed for us to perceive that Carlyle belongs to that thrice-winnowed class of literary primates whom posterity crowns. He holds in the nineteenth century a position similar to Johnson's in the eighteenth, and to Milton's in the seventeenth,—each masterful, but in a different way; each typifying his age without losing his individuality; all brothers in pre-eminence.

When, for convenience' sake, we classify Carlyle among men of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

letters, we fail to describe him adequately. The phrase suggests too little. Charles Lamb, the lovable, is the true type of men of letters, who illuminate, sweeten, delight, and entertain us. Carlyle was far more; he was a mighty moral force, using many forms of literature—criticism, biography, history, pamphlets—as its organs of expression. He had, as the discerning Goethe said of him, unborrowed principles of conviction, by which he tested the world. He felt the compulsion of a great message entrusted to him. There rings through most of his utterances the uncompromising "Thus saith the Lord" of the Hebrew prophets,—a tone which, if it do not persuade us, we call arrogant, yet which speaks the voice of conscience to those who give it heed. What, then, was his message?—what those unborrowed principles of conviction by which he judged his time?

Born in the poor village of Ecclefechan on December 4, 1795, his childhood and youth were spent amid those stern conditions by which, rather than by affluence, brave, self-reliant, earnest characters are moulded. His parents were Calvinists, to whom religion was the chief concern, and who taught him by example the severe virtues of that grim sect. Next to religion, and its active manifestation in a pious life, they prized education, begrudging themselves no sacrifices by which their son might attend the University of Edinburgh. They wished him to be a minister, but when he came to maturity he recognized his unfitness for that vocation and abandoned it. They acquiesced regretfully, little dreaming that he who refused to be confined in some Annandale pulpit should become the foremost preacher of his age.

Carlyle's reluctance was rooted in conscientious scruples. He began by questioning the authority of his Church; he went on to sift the authority of the Bible. Little by little the whole wondrous fabric of supernatural Christianity crumbled before him. He could not but be honest with himself; he could not but see how Hebrew legend had overgrown the stern ethical code attributed to Moses; how the glosses of Paul and Augustine and a hundred later religionists had changed or perverted the simple teaching of Christ. Awestruck, he beheld the God of his youth vanish out of the world. He wandered in the wilderness of doubt; he wrestled daily and nightly with despair. And then slowly, painfully, after brooding through long years, he saw the outlines of a larger faith emerge from the gloom. He fortified himself by acknowledging that, since righteousness is eternal, it cannot perish when we reject whatever opinions some Council of Westminster, of Trent, or of Nice may have resolved about it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Only earnest souls who have experienced the wrench which comes when we first break away from the bondage of an artificial religion, and perceive that the moral law may be something very different from dogmas, know the pang it costs. The dread of losing the truth when errors are thrown over—nay, the apparent hopelessness of being able to decide what is truth—causes many to hesitate, and some to turn back. Carlyle was not, of course, the first in Britain to tread the desolate path from Superstition into Rationalism. In the eighteenth century—to go no farther back—two very eminent minds had preceded him; but in both Hume and Gibbon the intellectual predominated over the moral nature, and to temperaments like theirs the pangs of new birth are always less acute. It is because in Carlyle the moral nature preponderated,—intense, fiery, and enduring,—that he became the spokesman of myriads who since him have had a similar experience.

If we were to hazard a generalization which should sum up the nineteenth century, might we not affirm that the chief business of the century has been to establish a basis of conduct in harmony with what we know of the laws governing the universe? Hitherto, for ages together, men have not consciously done this, but they have accepted standards handed down to them by earlier men, who compounded these standards out of little knowledge, much ignorance, legend, and hearsay. Sceptics there have always been, but usually, like the sceptics who flourished in the last century, they have differed from the doubters in ours by the degree of their moral intensity. Whether we turn to Carlyle or to George Eliot, we find each tirelessly busy in substituting for the worn-out tenets of the past, springs of belief and conduct worthy to satisfy a more enlightened conscience.

Here, then, we have the corner-stone of Carlyle's influence. Our world is a moral world; conscience and righteousness are eternal realities, independent of the vicissitudes of any church. If we seek for a definite statement of Carlyle's creed, we shall be disappointed; he never formulated any. After breaking loose from one prison, he would have scoffed at the idea of voluntarily locking himself up in another. He held that to possess a moral sense is to possess its justification; that conscience is a fact transcending logic just as consciousness or life itself does. In the presence of this supreme fact he cared little for its genealogy. The immanence of God was to him an ever-present, awful verity.

Likewise, when we come to examine his philosophy, we discover that he constructed no formal system. He absorbed the doctrine of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kant and his followers, and may be classed, by those who insist that every man shall have a label, among the transcendentalists: but his main interest was the application of moral laws to life, the trial of men and institutions in the court of conscience, rather than the exercise of the intellect in metaphysical speculations. The mystery of evil may not be explained for some ages, if ever; while we argue about it, evil grows: the one indispensable duty for all of us, he would say, is to combat evil in ourselves and in society now and here. The staunch seaman, when his ship founders, does not waste time in meditating why it should be that water will sink a ship, but he will build a craft, if haply he may thereby come off safe.

In these respects we behold Carlyle a true representative of his time. Before the vast bulk of sin and sorrow and pain, he did not cower; he would fight it manfully. But the smoke of battle darkened him. The spectacle of mankind, dwelling in Eternity, yet ignorant of their heritage, pursuing "desires whose purpose ends in Time"; of souls engaged from dawn to dusk of their swift-fleeting existence, not on soul's business, but on body's business, worshipping idols they know to be false, deceiving, persecuting, slaying each other,—confirmed a tendency to pessimism to which his early Calvinism had predisposed him. But Carlyle's pessimism must not be confounded with Swift's misanthropy, or with Leopardi's blank despair, or with the despicable Schopenhauer's cosmic negation of good. Carlyle was neither cynic nor misanthrope. He might exclaim with Ecclesiastes, "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity!" but he would mean that the ways and works of man are vain in comparison with his possibilities, and with the incalculable worth of righteousness. "Man's unhappiness, as I construe," he says, "comes of his greatness; it is because there is an Infinite in him which with all his cunning he cannot quite bury under the Finite. Always there is a black spot in our sunshine: it is even the *Shadow of Ourselves.*"

These being the elements of Carlyle's moral nature, let us look for a moment at the world which he was to test by his unborrowed principles of conviction. He came on the scene during the decade of reaction which followed the battle of Waterloo. Official Europe, confounding the ambition of Napoleon with the causes underlying the Revolution, supposed that in crushing one it had destroyed the other. The motto of the Old Régime had been *Privilege*, of the New it was *Merit.* The revived political fashions of the eighteenth century, though cut by such elegant tailors as Metternich, Castlereagh, and Polignac, chafed a generation which had grown used to a freer costume. At any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time there yawns between the ideals and the practices of society a discrepancy which provokes the censure of the philosopher and the sarcasm of the cynic; but in a time like the Restoration, when some men consciously repudiated and none sincerely believed the system thrust upon them, the chasm between profession and performance must open wider still, revealing not only the noble failures born of earnest but baffled endeavor, but also all the hideous growths of hypocrisy, of deceptions, insincerities, and intellectual fraud. And in very truth the Old Régime resuscitated by Europe's oligarchs was doubly condemned: first, as being unfitted to the new age; and second, as having marked in the eighteenth century, when it flourished, the logical conclusion of a political and social epoch. In 1820 the trunk and main branches of the tree of Feudalism were dead: he was not a wise man who imagined that the still surviving upper branches would long keep green.

Not alone in the political constitution of society were momentous changes operating. They but represented the attempt of man to work out, in his civic and social relations, ideas which had already penetrated his religion and his philosophy. Distil those ideas to their inmost essence, its name is *Liberty*. The old Church, whether Roman or Protestant, lay rotting at anchor in the land-locked bayou of Authority; and the pioneers of the new convictions, abandoning her and her cargo of antiquated dogmas, had pushed on across intervening morasses to the shore of the illimitable sea; yea, they were launching thereon their skiffs of modern pattern, and resolutely, hopefully steering whither their consciences pointed. Better the storms of the living ocean than the miasma of that stagnant, scum-breeding pool! But a church is of all institutions that to which men cling most stubbornly, paying it lip-service long after its doctrines have ceased to shape their conduct or to lift their aspirations; trying to believe, in spite of their unbelief, that it will continue to be to them a source of strength as it once was to their fathers; preserving forms, but veneering them with contradictory meanings; coming at last to declare that an institution must be kept, if for no other reason than because it once fulfilled the purposes for which it is now inadequate. The aroma of association has for some minds the potency of original inspiration. Who can ponder on life without perceiving that whereas in their business, their possessions, their love, and their hate, men resent dictation; in matters beyond the scope of experience, and consequently beyond proof,—as the conditions of a future life,—men credulously accept the guidance of others as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ignorant as themselves, from whom in their business or their passions they would submit to no interference.

Needless to say the revived Old Régime entrenched itself behind whatever church it found standing: in Prussia the Lutheran, in England the Anglican, in Scotland the Calvinist, in the Latin countries the Roman. The ecclesiastical institution might not humanize the masses, but it held them in check; it might not spiritualize the classes, but it taught them that in rallying to its support they were best guarding their own privileges. Metternich, whom we call the representative of the Restoration, did not scruple to announce that, as the dangers which threatened Church and State were identical, the Church could only be saved by upholding the State. Not for the first time in history was the priest a policeman in disguise.

Into this world of transition Thomas Carlyle strode with his store of unborrowed principles. Right or wrong, his convictions were his own; therefore they were realities that need not fear a conflict with ghosts of dead convictions and insincerities.

Naturally, one of the first facts that amazed him was the monstrous unreality in that transitional society. By the census the people of Great Britain were rated as Christians; by their acts they seemed little better than barbarians. What availed the Established Church, in which livings were assigned at the pleasure of some dissolute noble, fox-hunting parsons were given the cure of souls, and worldlings or unbelievers rose to be bishops? Could the loudest protestations explain the existence of great, gaunt, brutalized masses, beyond the pale of human charity; every working *horse* sleek, well lodged, and well fed, but innumerable working *men* dying of hunger or lodged in the almshouse? Can that be true civilization in which the various constituents recognize no interdependence, and only a few usurp benefits which are pernicious unless they be free to all? Respectability, and not virtue, —that, Carlyle declared, was John Bull's ideal, and he opened fire upon its chief allies, Sham and Cant. He spared no prejudices, he respected no institutions. With sarcasm until then unknown in English, he unmasked one artificiality after another, disclosing the cruelty or the hypocrisy which lurked behind it, and setting over against it the true nature of the thing it pretended to be. To interpret such conditions by the criterion of conscience was to condemn them.

But Carlyle's mission was not merely to destroy: he shattered error in order that the clogged fountain of truth might once more gush forth. Before eyes long dimmed with gazing on insincerity, he would hold up

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shining patterns of sincerity; souls groping for guidance, he would stay and comfort by precedents of strength; hearts pursuing false idols, he would chasten by examples of truth. Men talked—and nowhere more dogmatically than in the churches—as if God, after having imparted his behests to a few Hebrews ages ago, had retired into some remote empyrean, and busied himself no more with the affairs of men. But to Carlyle the immanence of God was an ever-present reality, manifesting itself throughout all history and in every individual conscience, but nowise more clearly than in the careers of great men.

Thus he made it his business to set before his contemporaries models worthy of veneration, for he recognized that worship is a primary moral need. "Great Men," he says, "are the inspired (speaking and acting) Texts of that divine *Book of Revelations*, whereof a Chapter is completed from epoch to epoch, and by some named *History*." In this spirit he introduced Goethe, the latest of the heroes, to English readers, as the man who, from amid chaos similar to that which bewildered them, had climbed to a position where life could be lived nobly, rationally, well. "Close your Byron, open your Goethe," was his advice to those in whom Byron's mingled defiance and sentimentality found an echo. He showed in Cromwell how religious zeal is something very different from a phantom faith. He laid bare the truth in Mahomet. He made Luther live again. And all to the end that he might convince his dazed contemporaries that in no age, if we look deeply, shall we look in vain for concrete, living examples of those qualities which are indispensable to right action; that salvation—the purging of the character—is won by exercising virtues, and not by conforming to a stereotyped routine; that the authority of conscience is a present fact, not a mere mechanism which God wound up and gave to the Hebrews, and has been transmitted by them to us. As an antidote to sterilizing doubt, Carlyle prescribed the simple remedy which sums up the wisdom of all the sages: "Do the Duty which lies nearest thee, which thou knowest to be a Duty! Thy second Duty will already have become clearer." In this fashion did Carlyle discharge his mission as a moral regenerator. We live as individuals, and to the individual conscience he made his appeal, caring little for the organization of principles into institutions. Rather, like every individualist, did he incline to deprecate the numbing effect of institutions. Let each unit be righteous, in order that whatever the collective units shall establish may be righteous too.

Bearing this in mind, we shall understand Carlyle's attitude toward

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the great social and intellectual movements of his time. The watch-word which had inspired generous minds at the end of the last century was *Liberty*, and after the thunders of the Napoleonic wars that had drowned it died away, it rang out its summons more clearly than before, never again to be quite deadened, despite all the efforts of the Old Régime. The application of the theory of Liberty to government resulted in setting up Democracy as the ideal political system. Since every citizen in the State bears, directly or indirectly, his fraction of the burden of taxation, and since he is affected by the laws, and interested, even to the point of laying down his life, in the preservation of his country, Democracy declares that he should have an equal part with every other citizen in determining what the taxes and policy of his State shall be; and it thrusts upon him the responsibility of choosing his own governors and representatives. To Carlyle this ideal seemed chimerical. Honest, just, and intelligent government is of all social contrivances the most difficult: by what miracle, therefore, shall the sum of the opinions of a million voters, severally ignorant, be intelligent? As well blow a million soap-bubbles, each thinner than gossamer, and expect that collectively they will be hard as steel! Or, admitting that the representatives Demos chooses be not so incompetent as itself, how shall they be kept disinterested? Their very numbers not only make them unmanageable, but so divide responsibility that any individual among them can shift from his own shoulders the blame for corrupt or harmful laws. Moreover, popular government means party government, and that means compromise. To Carlyle, principles were either right or wrong, and between right and wrong he saw no neutral ground for compromise. Party government cleaves to expediency, which at best is only a half-truth: but half-truth is also half-error, and any infinitesimal taint of error vitiates the truth to which it clings. Finally, Democracy substitutes a new, many-headed tyranny—more difficult to destroy because many-headed—for the tyranny it would abolish.

Such objections Carlyle urged with consummate vigor. He foresaw, too, many of the other evils which have accompanied the development of this system to impair its efficacy, such as the rise of a class of professional politicians, of political sophists, of corrupt "bosses," expert in the art of wheedling the ignorant many, and thereby of frustrating the initial purpose of the system. His opposition did not spring from desire to see the masses downtrodden, but from conviction that they need guidance and enlightenment, and that they are therefore no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more competent to choose their own law-makers than children are to choose their own teachers. In knowledge of public affairs Demos is still a child,—innocent, well-intentioned, if you will; but ignorant, and by this system left to the mercy of the unscrupulous.

This brings us to consider the charge that Carlyle, in his exaltation of the Strong Man, worshipped crude force. Let us grant that on the surface the accusation seems plausible: but when we seek deeper, we shall discover that he exalts Cromwell and Frederick, not because they were despots, but because, in his judgment, they knew better than any other man, or group of men, in their respective countries, how to govern. Their ability was their justification: their force but the symbol of their ability. "Weakness"—Carlyle was fond of quoting—"is the only misery." What is ignorance but weakness (through lack of training) of the intellect? In the incessant battle of life,—and few men have been more constantly impressed than Carlyle by the battle-aspect of life,—weakness of whatever kind succumbs to strength. Evil perpetually marshals its forces against Good,—positive, aggressive forces, to be overcome neither by inertia, nor indifference, nor half-hearted compromise, but by hurling stronger forces of Good against them. Interpreting Carlyle's views thus, we perceive why he extolled the Strong Man and distrusted the aggregate ignorance of Democracy. Furthermore, we must not forget that he never considered politics the prime business of life: first, make the masses righteous, next, enlightened, and then they will naturally organize a righteous and enlightened government. When Carlyle rejoined to the zealots of Democracy or other panaceas, "Adopt your new system if you must, will not the same old human units operate it? Were it not wiser to perfect them first?"—he antagonized the spirit of the age: wisely or not, only time can show. Those of us who would reject his arguments would nevertheless admit that Democracy is still on trial.

With equal fearlessness he attacked the cheap optimism based on material prosperity, which brags of the enormous commercial expansion made possible by the invention of machinery; which boasts of the rapid increase in population,—so many more million mouths to feed and bodies to clothe, and so much more food and raiment produced,—from decade to decade. These facts, he insisted, are not of themselves evidences of progress. Your inventions procure greater comfort, a more exuberant luxury: but do comfort and luxury necessarily build up character?—do they not rather unbuild it? Are your newly-bred millions of bodies more than bodies? Take a census of souls, has *their*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

number increased? Though your steam-horse carries you fifty miles an hour, have you thereby become more virtuous? Though the lightning bears your messages, have you gained bravery? Of old, your aristocracy were soldiers: is the brewer who rises from his vats to the House of Lords,—is any other man owing his promotion to the tradesman's skill in heaping wealth,—more worshipful than they? Let us not say that this amazing industrial expansion may not conduce to the uplifting of character; but let us strenuously affirm that it is of itself no indication of moral progress, and that, if it fail to be accompanied by a corresponding spiritual growth, it will surely lead society by the Byzantine high road to effeminacy, exhaustion, and death.

A different gospel, this, from that which Carlyle's great rival, Macaulay, was preaching,—Macaulay, who lauded the inventor of a useful machine above all philosophers! Different from the optimism —which gauges by bulk—of the newspapers and the political haranguers! Different, because true! Yet, though it sounded harsh, it stirred consciences—which smug flatterings and gratulations can never do; and it gave a tremendous impetus to that movement which has come to overshadow all others, the movement to reconstruct society on a basis not of privilege, not of bare legality, but of mutual obligations.

Any inventory, however brief, of Carlyle's substance, would be incomplete without some reference to his quarrel with Science. To Science a large part of the best intelligence of our age has been devoted,—a sign of the breaking away of the best minds from the sterilizing quibbles of theology into fields where knowledge can be ascertained. It is a truism that Science has advanced further in our century than in all preceding time. By what paradox, then, should Carlyle slight its splendid achievements? Was it not because he revolted from the materialistic tendency which he believed to be inseparable from Science, and which predominated a generation ago more than it does to-day? Materialism Carlyle regarded as a Gorgon's head, the sight of which would inevitably petrify man's moral nature.

Moreover, Carlyle's method differed radically from that of the scientific man, who describes processes and investigates relations, but does not explain causes. Pledged to his allegiance to tangible facts, the man of science looks at things serially, pays heed to an individual as a link in an endless chain rather than as an individual, lays emphasis on averages rather than on particulars. To him this method is alone honest, and, thanks to it, a single science to-day commands more authenticated facts than all the sciences had fifty years ago. But there are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

facts of supreme importance, which, up to the present at least, this method does not solve. The mystery of the origin of life still confronts us. Consciousness, the Sphinx, still mutely challenges the caravans which file before her. The revelations of Science seem, under one aspect, but descriptions of the habitations of life from the protoplasmic cell up to the human body. Immense though the value of such a register be, we are not deceived into imagining that it explains ultimates. How came life into protoplasm at all? Whence each infinitesimal increment of life, recognizable at last in the budding of some new organ? And when we arrive at man, whence came his personality? Each of us is not only one in a genealogical series stretching back to the unreasoning, conscienceless *amœba*, but a clearly defined individual, a little world in himself, to whom his love, his sorrow, his pain and joy and terror transcend in vividness all the experiences of all previous men: a microcosm, having its own immediate relations—absolute relations—with the infinite macrocosm. Science, bent on establishing present laws, measures by æons, counts by millions, and has warrant for ignoring your brief span or mine; but to you and me these few decades are all in all. However it may fare with the millions, you and I have vital, pressing needs, to supply which the experience of the entire animal kingdom can give us no help. Upon these most human needs Carlyle fastened, to the exclusion of what he held to be unnecessary to the furtherance of our spiritual welfare. He busied himself with ultimates and the Absolute. Not the stages of development, but the development attained; not the pedigree of conscience, but conscience as the supreme present reality; not the species, but the individual,—were his absorbing interests.

Thus we see how Carlyle approached the great questions of life invariably as a moralist. Mere erudition, which too often tends away from the human, did not attract him. Science, which he beheld still unspiritualized, he undervalued: what boots it to know the "mileage and tonnage" of the universe, when our foremost need is to build up character? In politics, in philosophy, in religion, likewise, he set this consideration above all others: before its august presence outward reforms dwindled into insignificance.

Such was the substance of Carlyle's message. Remarkable as is its range, profound as is its import, it required for its consummation the unique powers of utterance which Carlyle possessed. Among the masters of British prose he holds a position similar to that of Michael Angelo among the masters of painting. Power, elemental, titanic,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rushing forth from an inexhaustible moral nature, yet guided by art, is the quality in both which first startles our wonder. The great passages in Carlyle's works, like the Prophets and Sibyls of the Sistine Chapel, have no peers: they form a new species, of which they are the only examples. They seem to defy the ordinary canons of criticism; but if they break the rules, it is because whoever made the rules did not foresee the possibility of such works. Transcendent Power, let it take whatever shape it will,—volcano, torrent, Cæsar, Buonarotti, Carlyle,—proclaims: "Here I am,—a fact: make of me what you can! You shall not ignore me!"

Of Carlyle's style we may say that, whether one likes it or not, one can as little ignore it as fail to perceive that he makes it serve, with equal success, whatever purpose he requires. It can explain, it can laugh, it can draw tears; it can inveigh, argue, exhort; it can tell a story or preach a sermon. Carlyle has, it is computed, the largest vocabulary in English prose. His endowment of imagination and of humor beggars all his competitors. None of them has invented so many new images, or given to old images such fresh pertinence. Your first impression, on turning to other writings after his, is that they are pale, and dim, and cold: such is the fascination inalienable from power. Excess there may be in so vehement a genius: repetition there must be in utterances poured out during sixty years; an individuality so intense must have an equally individual manner; but there is, rightly speaking, no mannerism, for mannerism implies affectation, and Carlyle's primal instinct was sincerity. His expression is an organic part of himself, and shares his merits and defects.

Carlyle won his first reputation as a historian; singularly enough, his achievements in history have temporarily suffered a partial eclipse. Teachers in our colleges refer to them dubiously or not at all. Does the fault lie with these same teachers, or with Carlyle? A glance at the methods of the school of historical students which has sprung up during the last generation will explain the disagreement.

History, like every other branch of intellectual activity, has responded to the doctrines of Evolution. That most fertile working hypothesis has proved, when applied here, not less fruitful than in other fields. It has caused the annals of the past to be reinvestigated, every document, record, and monument to be gathered up, and the results have been set forth from the new point of view. Evolutionary science, as we saw above, fixes its attention primarily on the processes of development, and regards the individual, in comparison with a species or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the race, as a negligible quantity. A similar spirit has guided historical students. They have turned away from "great captains with their guns and drums," away from figure-head monarchs, away from the achievements of even the mightiest individuals, to scrutinize human action in its collective forms, the rise and supremacy and fall of institutions, the growth of parties, the waxing and waning of organisms like Church or State, in whose many-centuried existence individual careers are swallowed up. Using the methods of Science, these students have persuaded themselves that history also is a science, which, in truth, it can never be. Judicial temper, patience, veracity,—the qualities which they rightly magnify,—were not invented by them, nor are these the only qualities required in writing history. Speaking broadly, facts lie within the reach of any diligent searcher. But a fact is a mere pebble in a brook until some David comes to put it in his sling. True history is the arrangement and interpretation of facts, and—more difficult still—insight into motives: for this there must be art, there must be imagination.

To the disciples of the "scientific school" it may be said that the heaping up of great stores of facts—the collection of manuscripts, the cataloguing of documents, the shovelling all together in thick volumes prefaced by forty pages of bibliography, each paragraph floating on a deep, viscous stream of notes, each volume bulging with a score of appendices—is in no high sense history, but the accumulation of material therefor. It bears the same relation to history as the work of the quarryman to that of the architect; most worthy in itself, and evidently indispensable, but not the same. Stand before some noble edifice,—Lincoln Cathedral, for instance, with its incomparable site, its symmetry and majestic proportions: scan it until you feel its personality and realize that this is a living idea, the embodiment of strength and beauty and aspiration and awe,—and you will not confound the agency of the stone-cutters who quarried the blocks with that of the architect in whose imagination the design first rose. Neither should there be confusion between the historical hodman and the historian.

Indubitably, history of the highest kind may be written from the evolutionist's standpoint, but as yet works of the lower variety predominate. Naturally, therefore, in a time when the development of institutions chiefly commands attention, Carlyle, who magnifies individuals, will be neglected. But in reality, histories of both kinds are needed, to supplement each other. All institutions originate and exist in the activities of individuals. The hero, the great man, makes con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crete and human what would otherwise be abstract. Environment does not wholly explain him. It is easy to show wherein he resembles his fellows; that difference from them which constitutes his peculiar, original gift is the real mystery, which the study of resemblances cannot solve. Men will cease to be men when personality shall lose its power over them.

Accepting, therefore, the inherent antagonism in the two points of view,—antagonism which implies parity and not the necessary extinction of one by the other,—we can judge Carlyle fairly. Among historians he excels in vividness. Perhaps more than any other who has attempted to chronicle the past, he has visualized the past. The men he describes are not lay figures, with wooden frames and sawdust vitals, to be called Frenchmen or Germans or Englishmen according as a different costume is draped upon them; but human beings, each swayed by his individual passions, striving and sinning, and incessantly alive. They are actors in a real drama: such as they are, Carlyle has seen them: such as he has seen, he depicts them. To go back to Carlyle from one of the "scientific historians" is like passing from a museum of mummies out into the throng of living men. If his portraits differ from those of another artist, it does not follow that they are false. In ordinary affairs, two witnesses may give a different report of the same event, yet each may, from his angle of observation, have given exact testimony. Absolute truth, who shall utter it? Since history of the highest, architectonic kind is interpretation, its value must depend on the character of the interpreter. Not to be greatly esteemed, we suspect, are those grubbers among the rubbish-heaps who imagine that Carlyle's interpretation of the French Revolution, or of Cromwell, or of Frederick, may be ignored. Character, insight, and imagination went to the production of works like these: they require kindred gifts to be appreciated.

Neither of Carlyle's portrait-gallery, unparalleled in range, in which from each picture an authentic human face looks out at us; nor of his masterpieces of narration, long since laureled even by the unwilling,—is there space here to speak. In portraiture he used Rembrandt's methods: seizing on structural and characteristic traits, he displays them in strong, full light, and heightens the effect by surrounding them with shadows. As a biographer he succeeded equally well in telling the story of Schiller and that of John Sterling: the latter a most difficult task, as it must always be to make intelligible to strangers a beautiful character whose charm and force are felt by his friends, but have no proportionate expression in his writings. As an essayist he has left

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

models in many branches: "Mirabeau," "Johnson," "Goethe," "Characteristics," "Burns," "History," stand as foothills before his more massive works. His is creative criticism, never restricted, like the criticism of the schools, to purely literary, academic considerations, but penetrating to the inmost heart of a book or a man, to discover what deepest human significance may there be found. A later generation has, as we have noted, adopted a different treatment in all these fields: bending itself to trace the ancestry and to map out the environment of men of genius; concentrating attention on the chain rather than its links; necessarily belittling the individual to aggrandize the mass. It behooves us, while we recognize the value of this treatment as a new means to truth, not to forget that it is not the only one. By and by—perhaps the time is already at hand—we shall recognize that the other method, which deals with the individual as an ultimate rather than in relation to a series, which is human rather than abstract, cannot be neglected without injury to truth. Either alone is partial; each corrects and enlightens the other.

Meanwhile we will indulge in no vain prophecies as to Carlyle's probable rank with posterity. That a man's influence shall be permanent depends first on his having grasped elemental facts in human nature, and next on his having given them an enduring form. Systems struggle into existence, mature, and pass away, but the needs of the individual remain. Though we were to wake up to-morrow in Utopia, the next day Utopia would have vanished, unless we ourselves had been miraculously transformed. To teach the individual soul the way of purification; to make it a worthy citizen of Eternity which laps it around; to kindle its conscience; to fortify it with courage; to humanize it with sympathy; to make it true,—this has been Carlyle's mission, performed with all the vigor of a spirit "in earnest with the universe," and with intellectual gifts most various, most powerful, most rare. It will be strange if, in time to come, souls with these needs, which are perpetual, lose contact with him. But, whatever befall in the future, Carlyle's past is secure. He has influenced the *élite* of two generations: men as different as Tyndall and Ruskin, as Mill and Tennyson, as Browning and Arnold and Meredith, have felt the infusion of his moral force. And to the new generation we would say: "Open your 'Sartor'; there you shall hear the deepest utterances of Britain in our century on matters which concern you most; there, peradventure, you shall discover yourselves."

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PILGRIM PRINCIPLE AND THE PILGRIM HERITAGE.

OF ultimate Genevan extraction, fathered by English persecution, mothered in Netherland exile, gestated on the storm-tossed Atlantic, and brought forth on the ice-fringed Plymouth shore, the Pilgrim principle was the immediate responsibility of individuals to God. In that principle are combined a great spiritual truth and a serious practical error. The truth in it has moulded and transformed the nation, and is marching forward to the conquest of the world. The error it contains has robbed the church which they established of all but a fraction of its rightful heritage.

The positive truth of the Pilgrim principle lies in its affirmation of responsibility to God. The recognition of responsibility to God carries with it the right to worship Him according to the dictates of one's own conscience. Civil and religious liberty, toleration in opinion, democracy in government, equality before the law, the right of free inquiry and free speech,—are all involved in this great Pilgrim principle. And although as the Pilgrim entered into confederation with the more practical Puritan, he did in 1646, "after further consideration," assent to a declaration as to the "spreading nature of error and the dangerous growth and effects thereof," which recommended that "Anabaptism, Familism, Antinomianism, and generally all errors of a like nature be seasonably and duly suppressed," yet such intolerance was rather due to the instinct of political self-preservation, and an unconscious acceptance of the standards of the times, than to a conscious misapplication of the great principle to which he was committed.

By virtue of this principle of liberty of thought and word and action in subjection to God alone, the descendants of the Pilgrims and the Puritans have taken the lead in all save one of the great intellectual movements of the country. They were among the readiest to revolt against the unjust exactions of the mother country. They were leaders of the abolition movement. In the work of political organization alone they took a second place. The literature, oratory, philosophy, and theology of America are—with here and there a brilliant exception—the product of the descendants of the Pilgrims and the Puritans, the Congregationalists and the Unitarians. For, although the Unitarian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

contradicts at nearly every point the specific doctrines of the Congregationalist, in his intellectual attitude and moral temper he is the legitimate offspring of the Pilgrim principle. In its highest and purest form the intellectual life is possible to those alone who, consciously or unconsciously, have been trained by this Pilgrim principle to see things as they are, and to express them as they see them, uncorrupted by privilege, unfettered by authority, and untrammelled by tradition.

The weakness of the Pilgrim principle was no weakness in the men themselves. Such were the historic conditions under which Separatism arose in England that "even its failings leaned to virtue's side." As between the ecclesiasticism which culminated in the tyranny of Archbishop Laud, and "a church by themselves," the latter, which was then the only alternative, was practically the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. And the very weakness of their theoretical principle reveals the sublime strength of the men who dared to stake their fortunes, their lives, their hopes of heaven upon it.

The defects of their principle do not lie upon the surface. The casual reader of our first paragraph is doubtless at a loss to see how any serious practical error can lie concealed within so pious and orthodox a phrase as "the immediate responsibility of individuals to God." It looks as harmless as did the wooden horse within the walls of Troy. Yet within its heart that phrase conceals two vast negations which sooner or later will prove disastrous to the church which harbors them. One of these negations is wrapped up in the word "immediate." "Immediate" means "unmediated, without a medium." Now the unmediated worship and service of God is a psychological impossibility. Carried to its logical conclusion, this denial of mediation between God and the individual worshipper would lead to practical atheism and irreligion. The Pilgrims were at once practical and religious. And in the application of this negative aspect of their principle they stopped a long way short of its logical conclusion. They accepted implicitly the Bible as the Word of God. They acknowledged Jesus Christ as the Son of God. So far indeed God has come toward man. Here mediation stopped. Across the gulf of sixteen centuries no communication had come. While willing to seek advice of each other, they recognized no authoritative interpretation of either the letter of the Scriptures or the mind of Christ. To be sure, they had another principle of mediation which they freely used, and which in the exigencies of controversy they frequently referred to, but which they refused explicitly to recognize as such. For instance, one of the requirements made of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

freemen of the corporation in 1671 was that they "have the testimony of their neighbors that they are orthodox in the fundamentals of religion." In their condemnation of "new and strange and dangerous opinions," in which, to be sure, the Pilgrims were not so adept as their Puritan neighbors, there was the implicit recognition of a body of old, familiar, and safe opinions, by comparison with which the new, strange, and dangerous opinions were condemned. This accepted body of doctrine they had brought with them when they came out of the English church; and, with the exception of a few points on polity and worship, all the "fundamentals of religion" which they so jealously cherished had come to them through the medium of the historic church. Thus they explicitly denied what, implicitly held, was the very condition of their existence as a Christian church. They especially prided themselves on their disregard of the observance of the Christian festivals. The record of their first Christmas reads: "Monday, the 25th day, we went on shore: some to fell timber, some to saw, some to rive, and some to carry; so no man rested all that day." They abhorred everything that savored of ritual, except rites which, like the laying on of hands, had Scriptural sanction.

Their second negation is closely akin to the first. In making the individual, and the local group of individuals, immediately responsible to God, they lost sight of the organic relation of humanity to God. As the only channel of communication from God to man was Christ and the Scriptures, so the only way of approach from man to God was through the conscious voluntary act of the individual. At first, indeed, the logic of this negation was not rigorously applied. Children were recognized as members of the church of their parents. In the language of the Cambridge Platform, "the whole body of men throughout the world, professing the faith of the gospel and obedience unto God by Christ according unto it, . . . they and their children with them are and may be called the visible catholic church of Christ." With the Great Awakening, however, came the application of the logic of individualism in the demand for a conscious experience of a change of heart as evidence of membership in the kingdom of God. Thus an aggregation of groups of self-conscious individuals came to regard themselves as constituting the kingdom of God. Arrogance or indifference toward outsiders was the inevitable consequence of such attempted usurpation. The Great Awakening was an effort to rescue lost individuals as brands from the burning; and even the enthusiasm for foreign missions, which, within the present century, has done much to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

broaden the conception of the kingdom and reaffirm the organic relation of men to each other and of humanity to God, drew its inspiration at first from this same individualistic conception. The collision of this individualistic conception, which is unquestionably at the heart of historic Congregationalism, with the organic conception which has always been the soul of historic Christianity, accounts for the conscientious contentiousness of both parties in the recent controversy which raged about Andover Seminary and the American Board. As in our Civil War, where the same essential principles were in conflict in the political arena, both parties had history and tradition upon their side. In the Civil War universal history was on the side of the North; American history on the whole was on the side of the South. And the triumph of the principles of universal history was a blessing to both contestants. So in this theological controversy the history of the church universal was behind one party, and the history of Congregationalism was on the whole favorable to the claims of the other. And we begin to see that the victory of the larger principle will prove the salvation of the denomination which has been so reluctant to accept it. Of course superficial observers, and perhaps a considerable proportion of participants, saw only the superficial issues involved. But the real issues at stake were no more the question of subscription to a particular creed or a particular view of the duration of "probation," than the American Revolution was essentially a question of a tax on tea, or the Civil War a question as to the return of this or that fugitive slave. Underneath every shock which shakes the surface of the earth, the geologist recognizes the clash of cosmic forces ancient as the solar system; and underneath each conflict of opinion the philosopher discerns the collision of intellectual tendencies old as the human mind and fundamental as truth itself.

The strength and glory of the Pilgrim principle are universally recognized; and on the approaching Forefathers' Day, which is the two hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims, they will be appropriately celebrated wherever their descendants congregate. The weakness and defect of the negative aspects of their principle, when set up as permanent and universal, are not so well understood, nor so likely to receive adequate consideration. The splendid service wrought by their magnificent ideal, which of course is their main contribution to the world, may blind us to imperfections in the working of their practical scheme. From the more attractive work of tracing the beneficent influence of the Pilgrim principle upon the world at large, it may be worth while to turn aside for once to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

humbler task of examining the actual condition of the particular section of New England to which the Pilgrims came.

Mr. Eben Bumstead, the Superintendent of the Massachusetts Colportage Union, has kindly placed at my disposal the results of his recent canvass of a portion of Plymouth County. The statistics are more or less incomplete; as in all towns, with the exception of Rockland, no attempt was made to call a second time at houses at which no one was found the first time, and in the sparsely settled regions it was impossible to visit every house. That the reader may see for himself how incomplete the statistics are in each case, and to guard against misleading inferences concerning particular towns, I have placed in the first column the population of the town according to the census of 1890, and in the second column the number of persons found in the families visited by the colporteur. Thus the statistics vary from those for the town of Rochester, which give only 68 families (including 260 persons) in a town having a population of 1,012, to those for Rockland, which give 1,347 families (including 5,479 persons) in a town which had a population of 5,213 in 1890, and a population of 5,511 according to the State census of 1895. On an average about two-thirds of the population of the region are represented in the table. The towns comprise nearly the whole of the central, southern, and eastern part of Plymouth County, excepting the one large town of Plymouth. The populous towns in the north and northwestern part of the county, and a portion of the shore of Kingston and Duxbury, occupied by wealthy residents, are not represented. The region represented is pre-eminently that in which one would expect to find perpetuated the influence and tradition of the Pilgrims in the most pure and uncontaminated form.

While not complete, the figures are believed to be accurate, trustworthy, and reliable as far as they go. In the daily reports of the agent, from which I have taken them, the name of the head of the family, and the name of the street or district in which the family resides, are given in every case. The religious preference and the church attendance or non-attendance is the statement of the people themselves; and in no case has the judgment or opinion of the agent been allowed to modify their statement. In the matter of attendance upon church the showing is, if anything, too favorable, because it is human nature to give as good an account of one's self as possible; and where 40 per cent of the families of a community are not represented by the regular attendance of a single adult member, the proportion of individuals not attending church must be much larger. Furthermore, as no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RELIGIOUS PREFERENCES OF FAMILIES.

Towns	Population according to census of 1890	Number of persons in families visited	Number of families visited	Advent	Baptist	Christian	Congregational	Episcopal	Methodist	No preference	Presbyterians	Roman Catholic	Universalist	Unitarian	Other denominations	Number of families in which no adult attends any church regularly
Carver.....	994	624	169	15	26	..	20	..	37	58	..	1	6	1	5	20
Duxbury...	1,908	1,034	293	26	17	..	28	11	33	60	1	9	7	89	12	186
Halifax.....	562	422	127	..	8	..	47	2	8	43	5	3	6	2	3	68
Hanover....	2,093	1,535	408	2	55	..	84	42	22	111	2	32	27	12	19	193
Hanson.....	1,267	891	247	2	47	1	35	1	16	105	..	11	2	11	16	122
Kingston...	1,659	1,121	308	3	45	..	51	4	12	36	4	54	2	71	26	129
Lakeville...	935	302	76	1	11	8	34	..	8	8	..	3	..	2	1	22
Marion.....	871	618	174	1	1	1	65	9	56	10	1	2	27	1	..	69
Marshfield..	1,713	1,339	362	1	60	1	101	9	49	80	..	8	4	38	11	151
Mattapoiset.	1,148	744	211	14	2	34	58	3	11	29	1	3	48	..	8	101
Middleboro'.	6,065	3,982	1,054	12	263	..	248	37	214	115	4	83	7	57	14	199
Norwell	1,635	615	171	4	17	..	9	10	35	32	2	11	31	20	..	79
Pembroke ..	1,320	592	180	4	18	..	12	5	33	64	..	6	7	18	13	118
Plympton ..	597	379	113	..	3	..	43	2	5	54	1	1	..	1	3	70
Rochester ..	1,012	260	68	4	..	2	35	..	5	5	..	4	1	..	12	39
Rockland...	5,213	5,479	1,347	1	143	..	267	32	77	167	4	479	21	121	37	470
Wareham..	3,451	2,144	567	15	8	..	123	36	178	48	5	92	2	10	49	270
Totals....	32,443	22,081	5,875	105	724	47	1,260	203	799	1,025	30	802	198	454	229	2,306

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

questions beyond that of number of members and church preference were asked of Catholic families, these 2,306 unchurched families are all of Protestant antecedents. The table gives with absolute fidelity the account which 5,875 families, including 22,081 persons, in Plymouth County, give of their own religious preference and habits of church attendance.

In religious preference these 5,875 families are divided in the following proportion: Congregational, 21 per cent; no preference, 17 per cent; Roman Catholic and Methodist, each 14 per cent; Baptist, 12 per cent; Unitarian, 8 per cent; Episcopal and Universalist, each 3½ per cent; Advent, Christian, Friends, Presbyterians, and others, 7 per cent. Thus the Congregationalists have retained but a little more than one fifth of these families. Nearly 40 per cent, according to their own statement, are not represented by a single adult member in regular attendance upon any church whatsoever.

One practical lesson from these facts is obvious. The union of man with God must find expression in union with his fellow-men. A church by itself can hold together only so long as the common consciousness which it inherited from the universal church remains intact. Every new discovery of science, every fresh deliverance of criticism, every advance in general culture, every elevation in social standards, will split in twain each little group of individualists. As Malthusians tell us concerning the multiplication of the species, to the multiplication of sects and schisms there will be no limit short of the margin of bare subsistence. To the separation of Separatists there is no end. To erect the excuse for a particular revolt into a permanent principle of ecclesiastical organization, is a standing invitation to perpetual revolution. Both for their own salvation, and for the salvation of the unchurched masses around them, the churches which have inherited the traditions of the Pilgrims must conserve the Pilgrim truth without perpetuating the Separatist error.

Fortunately there are on every hand manifestations of a desire to restore the lost unity of Christendom. First there is the proposition of the Roman Catholic, which invites a return to the authority of the Pope. When the Roman Catholic shall have learned the lesson of the Pilgrim sufficiently to make the authority of the Pope a genuine representative expression of the Christian consciousness of the race in the free exercise of all its intellectual faculties and spiritual powers, then the churches of the world may welcome as *primus inter pares* the ancient See of Rome. This, which is doubtless the ultimate ideal, is beyond the range of present practical possibility.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The second plan is that of the Protestant Episcopal Church, reflected in the League of Catholic Unity recently organized on the basis of the acceptance of the Scriptures, the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the Historic Episcopate. It would permit wide differences concerning the mode of inspiration and interpretation of the Scriptures. It might recognize, in the words of the Rev. Frederic Palmer, in his "Studies in Theologic Definition," that "there is another view of creeds; and that is, to regard them not as attempting scientific accuracy of definition, but as approximate expressions of the truths of which they treat." The preamble to its constitution concedes liberty as to "particular modes of the administration of the sacraments, or special qualifications for their reception, or even theories of their efficacy." It proposes the Historic Episcopate as "a bond of organic unity among the Christian denominations by completing their Congregational, Presbyterial, or Episcopal systems, and at length re-combining them normally in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church." The League has already secured the membership of representatives of the Congregational, the Episcopal, and the Presbyterial types of church, so that it cannot be pronounced visionary or impracticable. Its basis is very broad and fair. And yet, like all compromises, it cannot be entirely acceptable to any party.

The third plan is that of the Congregationalists, the lineal descendants of the Pilgrims. At their National Council, held in October at Syracuse, New York, the Congregationalists commend the attempts already made in certain States to secure a unity of action in practical work, such as that described by me in a previous article,[1] and—

—"propose to other Protestant evangelical churches a union based on:

1. The acceptance of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments inspired by the Holy Ghost to be the only authoritative revelation of God to man.
2. Discipleship of Jesus Christ, the divine Lord and Saviour and the teacher of the world.
3. The Church of Christ, which is his body, whose great mission is to preach his gospel to the world.
4. Liberty of conscience in the interpretation of the Scriptures and in the administration of the church.

Such an alliance of the churches should have regular meetings of their representatives, and should have for its objects, among others:

1. Mutual acquaintance and fellowship.
2. Co-operation in foreign and domestic missions.
3. The prevention of rivalries between competing churches in the same field.

[1] "Church Union a Necessity: The Maine Experiment:" THE FORUM, April, 1893.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And whereas it cannot be expected that there shall be a speedy corporate union of the numerous bodies into which the Christian church of our own land is divided, we do therefore desire that their growing spiritual unity should be made manifest by some form of federation, which shall express to the world their common purpose and confession of faith in Jesus Christ, and which shall have for its object to make visible their fellowship, to remove misunderstandings, and to aid their consultations in establishing the kingdom of God in the world; and to this end we invite correspondence with other Christian bodies."

This proposition affirms all the essential principles for which the Pilgrim stood, and gives ample recognition to the rights of others, exercising proper liberty of conscience, to hold other truth and work in other ways not inconsistent with these principles. The approach to corporate union through the manifestation of the growing spiritual unity through some form of federation provides for the conservation of whatever is still valuable in the special doctrines and services for which the several denominations stand, and for the organization and expression of their oneness as fast as it is developed. This is the most practicable of the three plans.

The great truth which the Pilgrims brought with them to these shores the world will never suffer to be lost. Whether through a Catholic church made democratic and representative, or through Protestant sects federated into an unsectarian and universal body; whether through an orthodoxy that is courageous enough to think its doctrines through to their rational foundations, or through a liberalism that is earnest enough to demand at all costs a genuine piety; whether through a socialized church or a spiritualized state,—the sublime sense of responsibility to the Absolute and Eternal Source of truth and righteousness which the Pilgrims magnificently affirmed will never lack for men and institutions to claim it as their own.

On the other hand the particular vessels which they fashioned to contain their spiritual treasure have proved earthen and inadequate. The sense of the organic relationship of men to each other, and of humanity to God, was largely lacking in their scheme. Through that fatal gap much of their heritage has been suffered to escape: and though portions of it have been reclaimed by others, still a large fraction has been lost. The movement toward the enrichment of forms of worship, simplification of the formulas of faith, and co-operation in common lines of work and service, has come none too soon to save, for the church the Pilgrims loved, its hard-earned heritage.

WILLIAM DE WITT HYDE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE OBLIGATION OF THE INACTIVE.

A SMALL portion of leaven will leaven three measures of meal; of this we have the evidence of our senses, although we have not baked a batch of bread; we have also good authority for believing that the fact is a parable and has a deeper truth. And yet, alas, how prone is man to believe truth with the lips and doubt it with the heart; to draw dividing-lines between the possible and the actual; to differentiate between the ideal and the real; and to distinguish between theory and practice; forgetting that the possible may always become the actual, that the ideal is only a true ideal when it has a vital reality, and that theory has no warrant unless it can be applied to life.

It is strange logic, but it is a grave fact that some of our most virtuous citizens are inactive in the work of the Commonwealth because they shrink before the magnitude of the work there is to be done, and neglect their public duty because of flagrant public evil. They keep aloof from politics for dread of contamination; and, retiring to the serene seclusion of their libraries, fold their hands idly and decry public corruption because they do not dare to risk their small force against the surging tide of iniquity, and fear to expose their own purity to the pitch that they condemn, lest it should be defiled. Nor is the failure on their part limited by inertia. Wishing—perhaps unconsciously—to reconcile their conscience to their own apathy, they proclaim the uselessness of endeavor, defending what they call their practical common sense; they shrug their shoulders with chilling scepticism at the leaven other men would bring to raise this lump of dough into bread that may be broken for the body politic, and even, oftentimes, take the words "enthusiast" and "fanatic," and round them into petty bullets of scorn to fling at those "spirits bravely pitched, earth's manlier brood," who are "set on flame by the pure fire that flies all contact base"; but who, "choosing danger and disdaining shame," throw themselves into the midst of the evil to fight it to the death.

For the men who are sunk in a hopeless lethargy of pessimism and despair there should be less condemnation, for they are as the blind and can discern no light; for men who have sold themselves to Satan

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there should be a measure of pity, for they are under the bondage of their cruel debt; but for men with eyes and ears and consciences to stand upon this neutral ground is far more reprehensible in its wrong. He who makes a negative resistance to the thing his conscience approves is more to be condemned than he who fiercely fights a right that his conscience is too callous to discern. It is Pilate, who washed his hands of the whole affair, and not Judas, who betrayed the Christ, that in the Creed is daily associated with the deed throughout all Christendom.

Political evils, corruption, and immorality in high places and low, impure legislation, and the "rings" that have circled round our cities—contracting and crushing the moral life of our people into their compass—are deplored, decried, and bemoaned on every side; journals and magazines vie with each other in denouncing them; and yet, when—glowing with eager faith and hope, filled with ardor and enthusiasm for Reform—some zealous citizens arise, they are laughed at, or watched in idle curiosity, with amused questioning as to the result of their extravagant endeavor, by those who should make haste to help them. Woe to that man who, believing in the right, hampers Reform by a neutralizing negative because he doubts the wisdom of the method. Small streams may irrigate and fertilize a sandy soil; but if a man, flattering himself that his ideas are too large for small streams, stops them in the beginning, the country will remain unredeemed while he is waiting for a satisfactory method on his own scale.

A little leaven will leaven a large lump, but if the hand that would contribute it is laughingly pushed aside by some bystander who thinks the leaven ludicrously small compared with the lump of dough, the truth of the prophecy cannot be demonstrated.

In great emergencies, though more would be better than less, something is better than nothing; and we should eagerly, gladly conserve and encourage every honest effort at action, every earnest enthusiasm, in this hour of public need. Enthusiasm may be neutralized by sneers, and faith prevented from removing mountains by another's doubt.

To-day is a crisis in the Commonwealth. A new dawn has come in the night of our political life; a new tide of Reform has begun to sweep over our land. Men's consciences are aroused, their moral natures are awake. The efforts to change the order and bring in a truer, a purer, a cleaner system, a higher and a nobler standard, is evidenced by the Good-Government and Reform clubs, the gathering and growing interest in all questions of Reform, and the signal instances where Reform has been accomplished by persistent and vigorous effort.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now is the time for each man and woman to arise to the opportunity of the moment. To each man, and to each woman, belongs his and her share of responsibility for the conditions they deplore; and it is petty and trivial, unworthy of a rational human being, to put into complaint the energy that might go into effort. Each man is a unit, and adds one more to the force that may oppose existing evils. As for woman, her present duty is clear, her opportunity potential,—whatever her future sphere may be. The Roman mother who buckled on her son's sword did not go to the war, but she contributed to the victory. The Spartan wife whose parting salutation to her husband was to come home on his shield or with it, gave him a glowing inspiration that spurred him on to conquest.

If women weaken men, or lure them from their duty to the body politic, by their selfish claims or their capricious vanity, they are as guilty as the men who neglect their public duty—perhaps more guilty. He who made Israel to sin was punished more severely than the sinner, in the wise Hebraic dispensation. If women sympathize, stimulate, cultivate, and intelligently urge their husbands, sons, and lovers to their public duty, they are doing a sure work for the state while waiting for the state to grant the claims they urge.

O that men would rouse themselves and join this great crusade! But if—through conditions, inability, or circumstance—a man may not bear the lance himself, at *least* let him encourage and cheer his brother in the lists. If he, too fearful, doubts the quest, thinks it vague and visionary, "a wandering fire that will be lost in the quagmire," at least let him keep silent and beware how he imperils it by any jeer or sneer or questioning. Let him designate his ardent brother, if he will, as an "enthusiast"; but let the name bear the stimulating distinction of a title or a degree in its intonation, as he says it,—not the flavor of a jesting taunt, nor even of a good-natured forbearance and sceptical patience.

Let the Inactive remember that—as Sophocles has well said—"one soul working in the strength of love is mightier than ten thousand to atone"; whether it be the love of God or friend or country; and that the moral enthusiast, strong in the love of his state and the love of right, may have a power beyond the seeming, which should be reinforced, quickened, and sustained by the faith, the confidence, the sympathy of his fellowmen. This, at least, may the Inactive contribute, and that much lessen the magnitude of his failure in the obligation of his citizenship.

KATRINA TRASK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CRIME AMONG ANIMALS.

THE gulf which the philosophers of former centuries created between men and animals no longer exists; the theory of evolution and general psychology having shown that there is no break whatever in the long chain of living beings. Everything one meets with in communities formed by man is also to be found, on a smaller scale and in rough outlines, among the animal species; for all beings capable of movement, of receiving sensations, and of feeling emotions, are subject to the same general laws of existence. No science has been more useful in showing the universal fraternity existing between all living beings than general psychology; no discovery made by the human mind has been so great or so full of poetry as that which has led man to recognize a part of himself throughout the whole realm of nature, even in the humblest of animals.

This is why the school of criminal anthropology founded by Prof. Lombroso, the eminent Italian savant, has endeavored to discover in the animal species the origin of the mysterious and terrible phenomenon we call "crime." The idea has given rise to a considerable number of objections, mainly because Prof. Lombroso has quoted, as examples of crime among animals, certain actions which cannot be regarded as real crimes, as they are solely the result of the struggle for existence. But if we leave out these actions, whose true nature Prof. Lombroso has failed to recognize, we shall find that animals do become guilty of real crimes when, without the slightest necessity, they commit actions which are hurtful to their species, or, in the case of gregarious animals, to their companions. Among animals, as among men, there are individuals which are incapable of living and satisfying their wants without doing some harm to their fellows; therefore they are abnormal and criminal beings, for their actions do not tend to ensure the prosperity of their species. Almost every form and variety of human crime is thus to be found among animals.

Cases of theft are noticed among bees. Büchner, in his "Psychic Life of Animals," speaks of thievish bees which, in order to save themselves the trouble of working, attack well-stocked hives in masses,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

kill the sentinels and the inhabitants, rob the hives, and carry off the provisions. After repeated enterprises of this description they acquire a taste for robbery and violence; they recruit whole companies which get more and more numerous; and finally they form regular colonies of brigand-bees. But it is a still more curious fact that these brigand-bees can be produced artificially by giving working-bees a mixture of honey and brandy to drink. The bees soon acquire a taste for this beverage, which has the same disastrous effects upon them as upon men; they become ill-disposed and irritable, and lose all desire to work; and finally, when they begin to feel hungry, they attack and plunder the well-supplied hives. There is one variety of bees—the *Sphecodes*—which lives exclusively upon plunder. According to Marchall, this variety is formed of individuals of the *Halyetes* species, whose organs of nidification were defective, and which have gradually developed into a separate variety, living almost exclusively by plunder. They may thus be said to be an example of innate and organic criminality among insects, and they represent what Prof. Lombroso calls the born criminals,—that is, individuals which are led to crime by their own organic constitution.

According to the observations of Linnæus and Tesse, which Romanes believes to be probable, sparrows are sometimes guilty of real robbery with regard to swallows' nests; and the swallows in their turn defend themselves and take their revenge. The following account of a case of this description has been given by Tesse:

"Some swallows had built their nests under the windows of the first floor of an uninhabited house in Merrion Square, Dublin. A sparrow took possession of the nest, and in vain the unfortunate swallows endeavored to retain their hold upon it. They were forced to abandon the nest; but they returned with a band of their companions, each of whom was provided with a little lump of mud. The entrance to the nest was soon blocked up, and the intruder found himself a prisoner."

Sometimes, according to the same author, their revenge takes a different form. He writes:

"At Hampton Court a couple of sparrows took possession of a nest built by a couple of swallows, in spite of an obstinate resistance on the part of the latter. Having once established themselves, the intruders were no longer molested. But the day came when they were obliged to leave the nest in search of food for their young; then, as soon as they were out of sight, several swallows came to demolish the nest, and I saw the young sparrows lying dead upon the ground."

Real instances of theft may also be observed among pigeons, in the artificial communities formed by dove-cotes. Signor Muccioli, Secre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tary to the Roman society for pigeon-breeding, has remarked that in almost every dove-cote there are individuals which try to obtain the material necessary to build their nests by abstracting it from the heap of straws collected by the others for that purpose; in short, they try to procure what they need at their neighbors' expense rather than go in search of it themselves. Moreover, according to Signor Muccioli, these thieves show themselves lazy, idle, and bad carriers, flying slowly and often losing their way, so that they are not to be relied upon. Thus the same psychological characteristic is to be found among these thieves as among those of human species,—the inability to work. This kind of pigeon is therefore almost always carefully excluded from dove-cotes, either because they do not produce good carriers, or because they become troublesome through their thievish propensities.

Cases of theft have at times been remarked among female dogs, but such cases are almost always influenced by maternal love. Certain dogs which, when in a normal condition, are very well behaved and respect their masters' property, begin to steal when they have puppies, and they steal anything that the latter will eat. It is still more curious that certain sterile dogs will steal the young belonging to others, in order to form a family,—a family which in most cases dies, notwithstanding the solicitude of its adopting parent, which is affectionate, but is unable to discharge a mother's duties. According to M. Espinas, something similar to this may be observed among mules: certain mules luring foals away from their mothers, in order to satisfy a morbid maternal instinct; then, being unable to bring them up, letting them die of starvation.

Nor is murder wanting among animals: that is to say, not murder such as is caused by the exigencies of the struggle for life; but murder committed under the influence of individual malice or passion. It would be absurd to declare that the hawk which kills a swallow is a criminal, for he is only fighting out his struggle for existence; but, on the other hand, animals which kill others of their own species are guilty of a true criminal act when they do so for any other reason than that of self-defence. Thus, Karl Vogt, the celebrated German naturalist, has observed a couple of storks that had for several years built their nest in a village near Salette. One day it was noticed that, when the male was out in search of food, another younger bird began to court the female. At first he was repulsed, then tolerated and welcomed; at last, one morning, the two birds flew away to the field where the husband was hunting for frogs, and killed him. According to Brehm, storks often

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

murder the members of the flock which either refuse to follow them at the time of migration or are not able to do so. Parrots, although frugivorous birds as a rule, will sometimes attack their companions and crush their skulls by repeated blows from their beaks. Female partridges love their young very dearly, but their jealousy of their companions is so great that they often kill each other's young. Houzeau has noticed among anthropomorphic monkeys,—especially among the females in menageries,—that they treat each other with the greatest cruelty, and sometimes even kill each other. It is a peculiar feeling of hatred for the individuals of their own sex which often leads them to murder.

Infanticide is a crime of very frequent occurrence among animals. In almost all zoological species we find females which refuse to be burdened with the bringing up of their young; sometimes they abandon and sometimes they kill them. There is no doubt that these are instances of real criminals,—of individuals affected with a very serious psychic defect which renders them incapable of discharging the most important of their duties toward their kind. Signor Muccioli noticed a dove in his dove-cote which killed the young of every brood by crushing their skulls with her beak. Professor Lombroso has seen a hen which used to make a selection among her young similar to that made by the Spartans: she killed the feeble and lame chicks and only brought up those which were healthy and strong. Brehm tells us about a female Astur which was confined in a cage, but received plenty of food. This, however, not being living prey, and so not satisfying her, she finally devoured her young. Certain dogs occasionally abandon their young, after having tended them for several weeks, without its being possible to understand the cause of this sudden aversion.

Crimes caused by mental alienation or by some psychic trouble are also to be found among the more intelligent species,—crimes very much resembling those caused by madness in man. Thus, among elephants, there are instances in which individuals are seized with a desire to kill other elephants and men without provocation, whereas, normally, the elephant has an extremely meek and peaceable character. The natives of India call these elephants *hora;* and their morbid state of mind is attributed to the solitude in which they live. If an elephant accidentally loses his way and is unable to find his herd, he cannot hope to be admitted into any other herd; he can feed in their vicinity, and drink and bathe where they do, but apart from these distant approaches

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no other fellowship is granted him. Then such an elephant, excluded from the society of his fellows, becomes a *hora*. Formerly peaceable and magnanimous, he now attains a ferocity unknown in any other animal; continually beset by a kind of cold rage, he attacks every creature he meets, and even lies in ambush for travellers, whom he savagely attacks. If the language of modern psychiatry could be applied to elephants, one would be tempted to attribute this condition to a form of hysteria owing its origin to solitude, and to that total change in the animal's whole existence which attends the passage from social life to loneliness.

Another kind of crime caused by some passing psychopathy has been observed in the *Formica rufibarbis*. According to Forel, female combatants often, after a fight, fall into a passionate fury, in which they blindly try to bite everything around,—the larvæ, their companions, and even the slaves who endeavor to calm them by seizing their feet and holding them until their fit of rage shall have passed off. This is something analogous to the mad thirst for blood, the feverish desire to kill, that sometimes seizes men in time of war, and the frightful consequences of which have been especially observed by travellers among savage African tribes. The warriors often get so heated in battle that they continue to kill even after having gained a victory; they murder the wounded, attack the enemy's village, and massacre the women, children, and animals; sometimes even finishing by killing each other under the influence of this transitory madness.

Such wickedness and cruelty are occasionally innate among other animals. Rodet, a distinguished French veterinary surgeon, says that in every regiment of cavalry one may always find some horses which rebel against discipline and let no opportunity escape them of doing harm either to man or to their companions. In dealing with such it is necessary to be always on one's guard; and it is frequently imperative that they be separated from the others in the stables, as they try to steal their companions' food. What is still more curious, these horses are said to present an anomaly in the formation of their skulls, having a narrow and retreating forehead, a feature which induced M. Rodet to call them *chevaux à nez busqué*. Moreover, according to Cornevin, the Arabs will not admit into their *haras* the offspring of horses which are thus affected and which present this peculiar physiognomy.

This fact might lead us to suspect that the phenomena which relate to the hereditary nature of criminal instincts are not observable in the human species only. Other facts, indeed, can be quoted in support of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this hypothesis, to prove that the laws of criminal heredity are the same in man and in animals. It is known that, according to Professor Lombroso's theory, the hereditary transmission of crime in man is sometimes direct and sometimes indirect; that is to say, sometimes a criminal son is born of a criminal father; sometimes, on the contrary, a criminal's son is afflicted with a different form of degeneracy. In short, crime sometimes engenders crime; but sometimes it engenders madness, sterility, idiocy, physiological and mental weakness, eccentricity, and the like. The following account, given by Signor Cristiani, the Director of the Lucca Lunatic Asylum, would seem to prove that the same phenomena are to be remarked among the more intelligent species of animals. Being both a distinguished psychologist and a passionate sportsman, his observations are doubly valuable.

Signor Cristiani possessed a family of bird-dogs of which one couple—male and female—was distinguished by great intelligence: both were exceptionally clever dogs. These dogs had two young ones, a male ("Ali") and a female ("Popa"). Popa suffered from convulsions and was a real criminal; it was impossible to let her run in the streets because she attacked all the dogs she met and tried to bite them. In spite of whippings and of all kinds of punishments, she could not be taught to respect other people's property; besides she amused herself by destroying things. Ali was very intelligent and showed no criminal tendencies, but he was of a very capricious temperament. Had he been a human being, one would have called him an eccentric and peculiar individual. For instance, he would sometimes refuse to go hunting, and it was impossible to make him accompany any one but his master on shooting expeditions. Even when the latter was hunting, the dog would not go after a bird unless he were sure that his master was on the watch. Finally, although still young and strong, he refused to accompany even his master, and since then the latter had to give up making any use of him. Ali and Popa engendered two males, named "Nilo" and "Fido." Fido was a fine dog; Nilo, on the contrary, was extremely ugly, suffered from convulsions, and showed his father's peculiarities combined with his mother's bad qualities. Fido and Nilo were bred with strange dogs of a normal character. The young of the former—two females—were very good-natured, but extremely stupid and almost incapable of searching for birds. Nilo engendered a female, "Scilla," a fairly fine dog; but she too was stupid and sterile.

In this family of dogs is thus to be seen the characteristic develop-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment of hereditary crime, just as in the human species it has been described by Professor Lombroso. Two parents of a more than average intelligence beget a criminal dog, and an eccentric one which is half mad; of these two there is born a normal individual, and one which is ugly, criminal, and eccentric. The young of the normal individual are stupid, whereas the criminal individual begets a sterile female.

Thus, all the phenomena of human crime are found among the animal species, but on a smaller scale. The animals are in a certain sense less criminal than men. When we wish to convey the idea that a man is extremely cruel, we say that he is like a wild beast; but this is an insult to animals which the latter do not deserve, for they never attain the hideous monstrosities of man. Man is, indeed, the most ferocious of all beings. Is it possible, in the zoological world, to find anything similar to the cruelties practised by the savage tribes of Africa (the Dahomey tribe for instance); or of certain conquerors such as Tamerlane; or of certain criminals like Troppmann? However, there is nothing to astonish us in this: man is capable of attaining a higher degree of evil than any other animal, but he is also capable of reaching a higher degree of good. The cause of this is his superior intelligence. Intelligence is an instrument that can be wielded for good as well as for evil: it can help a philanthropist, a statesman, or an inventor to diminish the number and intensity of human woes, just as it can assist a criminal to dupe, rob, and murder his fellow men. Man has had to pay for his immense pre-eminence in good by a pre-eminence in evil. The one superiority implies the other; and the species which produces the greatest heroes cannot fail, on the other hand, to produce the greatest criminals.

WILLIAM FERRERO.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAS THE MORMON CHURCH RE-ENTERED POLITICS?

WHEN, in September, 1890, President Wilford Woodruff of the Mormon Church announced at the semi-annual Conference in the Salt Lake Tabernacle a revelation forever suspending polygamy, most of the Gentiles in Utah received his professions with smiling incredulity. It was regarded as a temporary expedient whereby the Church might be put in harmony with the laws of the land without the humiliating confession that a cardinal tenet of the Mormon religion was wrong in principle. When, one year later, President Woodruff declared a divorce of Church and State in Utah, the same significant distrust pervaded a majority of the Gentile population. Between these dates the "People's" or "Church" party had disbanded, reorganizing as the Democratic and Republican parties of the Territory. The new parties were joined by a small contingent from the "Liberal" or "Anti-Church" party, leaving that organization composed almost exclusively of Republicans.

As time elapsed, and the progress of events indicated more clearly the sincerity of the Mormon people, the Liberal party gradually disintegrated. By November, 1893, faith in the Mormon people had become so general that the Liberal party formally disbanded. Only a few radicals continued to distrust the Mormon Church. Political confidence between Mormons and Gentiles, established after so many years of bitter antagonism, bore fruit in closer commercial and social relations. All elements of the community became firmly cemented, the people working together in a common purpose for the upbuilding of the Territory. This happy condition of affairs continued till within the past month, when suddenly from one of the great political parties arose the cry that the Mormon Church was "again in the saddle," and that Mormon authorities were attempting to dictate the course of politics. This charge, publicly made by the Executive Committee of the Democratic party, created instant consternation. A "crisis" was proclaimed, and a State convention of the Democratic party was called to take radical measures in regard to the alleged Church interference. The most inflammatory reports were spread broadcast, and the telegraph

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conveyed over the United States the news of a reawakening conflict in Utah.

To appreciate properly the real situation it is not necessary to go farther back than the promulgation of the Church manifesto abolishing polygamy. In a previous article[1] in THE FORUM I made the assertion that the "Mormon question" had been in Utah a political one, while outside Utah it had been a religious and social one; that polygamy was only "the scapegoat upon which the anti-Mormon population of Utah had piled its combined grievances." That statement, made five years before, would have brought upon me the wrath of every Gentile in Utah. Passion and prejudice having passed away, it was received without a dissenting voice. Not polygamy, but the domination of the State by the Church, had aroused the greatest opposition from the Gentiles of Utah. If the Gentiles of the Territory believed that the Church was now interfering in politics, or suspected it of having designs upon the new State after its admission to the Union, there would be an instant re-forming on old lines. Notwithstanding the complete abandonment of polygamy, the fight against the Church would be more fierce than in the old days, for the reason that the Gentiles would now be reinforced by a large element of the Mormons themselves. There is no point upon which the masses of the people in the Territory are more sensitive than upon that of ecclesiastical interference in State affairs. This was illustrated in the excitement produced by the recent cry of "Church interference." That, notwithstanding the commotion, there has not been a single move toward re-forming the old parties, conclusively proves the groundlessness of the charge that the Church was guilty of an attempt to dictate in matters of state. Nevertheless the impression has been created outside Utah that the conflict between Mormons and Gentiles has been reopened; and a general feeling exists inside the Territory that statehood has been seriously jeopardized by the action of those who sounded a false alarm in order to gain a partisan advantage. Indeed, this would seem to have been one of the purposes in raising the issue. While a reaction has taken place against those responsible for the scare, the incident has served a good purpose in calling attention to one feature of public life in Utah that is unhealthy, if, indeed, it is not fraught with actual danger. This feature—the selection of Church officials as political candidates—is one the alarmists would have most preferred to have kept

[1] "Will the Polygamists Control the New State of Utah?" THE FORUM, December, 1894.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the background. The occasion of the outcry, however, and the effect produced within and without the Territory, are full of interest.

Upon the disbandment of the People's or Church party in 1891, the mass of the Mormons affiliated with the new Democratic party of the Territory. This resulted from a variety of causes. It had been during the Republican administrations that the laws directed against polygamy had been enacted. It fell chiefly to Republican governors, judges, and marshals to execute those laws. The Gentile or Liberal party had been mainly composed of those who were Republicans in national politics. The Mormon Church had been represented in Washington by Democratic attorneys for many years, and Mormon newspapers in Utah had long espoused Democratic doctrines. This combination of circumstances led the great majority of the Mormon people into the Democratic ranks when the "division movement" came. Utah was confidently claimed as a Democratic stronghold, and no Republican had the temerity to dispute the claim. A succession of rapidly occurring events changed political sentiment within the space of a few years. Upon the disbandment of the Liberal party, its leader, Judge O. W. Powers, who had been especially obnoxious to the Mormons, took a place in the Democratic party and is the present Chairman of the Democratic State Committee. This episode impressed yet more forcibly on the Mormon mind the fact that in the long fight against the Mormon Church the issues of national politics had no bearing. Shortly before the disbandment of the Liberals in Utah, President Cleveland entered upon his second administration. Each of his two principal recommendations to Congress—the repeal of the Sherman purchasing act and the repeal of the McKinley bill—struck a blow at the commercial prosperity of Utah. Whatever the merits or demerits of these two measures from the broad national view, there can be no two opinions as to their effect upon this Territory. The repeal of the Sherman purchasing act took away the last prop from silver, greatly injuring the mining interests. The Wilson bill badly crippled the sheep industry,—next to mining the most important interest in the Territory,—and injured the beet-sugar industry, which had but recently been established here by the Mormon people. The consequent fall in the price of silver, raw wool, and sugar-beets told effectively on public sentiment in the Territory, causing a widespread change from Democratic to Republican belief. Again, one of the cardinal doctrines of the Mormon Church, in its practical relations to the people, had been the fostering of home industries. Brigham Young

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had preached it incessantly, and the Mormon pioneers practised it from the first days of their entrance into the Salt Lake Valley. The doctrine of protection, as promulgated by Republican speakers throughout the Territory, having been so long inculcated by religious teachers, found ready acceptance. This added to the growing Republican sentiment. The local Democracy, catering to the desires of the Mormons, had for several years advocated the abolition of the Utah Federal Commission, and the entrusting of Territorial elections to the people. With the inauguration of a Democratic President and the appointment of a Democratic Commission, there was a sudden change of front, the Republicans favoring and the Democrats opposing the attempt to abolish this arm of the Federal government.

All these influences operated to cause a secession of Mormons from the Democratic ranks. The Republican vote, which had been 6,613 in 1891, increased to 12,390 in 1892, 14,221 in 1893, and 21,343 in 1894, the Republicans electing their delegate to Congress in the latter year by a plurality of 1,820. This wholly unexpected result struck terror among the local Democratic leaders. In asking support for statehood from their national party, they had promised Utah as a Democratic State. Failing to keep their party obligations, they were forced to offer some plausible excuse to the country for the rapid change of sentiment in the Territory. This was attempted by raising the cry of "Church interference."

Both parties, with the instinct of politicians, had, from the moment of division on national lines, recognized the importance of the Mormon vote in determining the political complexion of the new State. Both had sought for means whereby permanently to attach this doubtful vote. By a curious circumstance, as noted in my former article in THE FORUM, many of the very politicians who had for years inveighed against Church influence in State affairs now appealed to religious prejudice in the hope of advancing party interests. In the campaign of a year ago the Democrats circulated a political catechism endeavoring to show that Republicans had been responsible for all the woes suffered by the Mormon people. The Republicans distributed a tract to prove that Prophet Joseph Smith, Jr., Brigham Young, and other leaders reverenced by the Mormon people, had been Republicans. This line of argument found little favor among the Mormons, who resented it as appealing to their prejudices and not to their intelligence. A more subtle and effectual method of catching the "Church vote," adopted by both parties, was the nomination of prominent Mormon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dignitaries for public office. Bishops, elders, counsellors, presidents of the "Seventies," and other ecclesiastics, were nominated for the manifest purpose of attracting the Mormon vote. The present year it was carried to an unprecedented extreme by the Democrats nominating for the United States Senate (to be voted for by the people) an apostle of the Mormon Church, second in authority only to the First Presidency itself. An exactly parallel case would be the nomination of Cardinal Gibbons for the United States Senate in a close State like New York, legislative nominees being pledged, if elected, to vote for him as the choice of the party. The storm of criticism that would follow such an extraordinary appeal to the Catholic vote can well be imagined. Yet a precisely similar appeal was made to the Mormon people for their suffrages. It is but just to the Mormons to state that in most instances where Church officials have been nominated by either party, it has been at the behest of Gentile politicians. The candidacy of such churchmen has been urged by the very men who a few years ago were most vehement in denouncing religious influence in politics. In a recent convention in Salt Lake City a Mormon leader who was being advanced for a nomination against a Gentile came to me to say that he did not want the office, that he was fighting against the nomination, and that if it came to him it would be by an exclusively Gentile vote. The spectacle, strange anywhere but in Utah, was presented of Mormon delegates working for a Gentile, and Gentile delegates for a Mormon. The Gentiles were outspoken in urging this gentleman to accept the nomination in order to "draw the Mormon vote," which in their estimation was "a duty he owed his party." A natural and inevitable sequence to the election of high ecclesiastics to public office is the charge of their opponents that success was due to "Church influence."

Anomalous as it seems, the recent so-called "crisis" in political affairs came from the efforts of the First Presidency to keep ecclesiastics out of politics. Joseph F. Smith, one of the three presidents of the Mormon Church, at a Priesthood meeting in Salt Lake City, took exception to the action of salaried officers of the Church who had accepted political nominations without consulting their superior authorities. His remarks, as given in the official Church report, were as follows:

"President Smith, after speaking briefly on the obligations involved in the Holy Priesthood, said that any man who takes the bit into his own mouth, saying, 'I have a right to do as I please,'—it matters not whether he be Apostle, Seventy, High Priest, or Elder,—if he acted in that spirit he trod on dangerous ground. Re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ferring to himself, President Smith said he had been chosen to be one of the Counsellors to the President, a position he neither sought nor desired; and since he had been called to occupy that position he fully realized that in and of himself he did not possess power and wisdom sufficient to honor it acceptably to God and his brethren. He felt the same when he was called to be one of the Twelve Apostles. But, having accepted these positions, with a realizing sense of the responsibilities attached to them, he regarded it as his duty, before undertaking to do anything that would interfere in any way with his regular church duties, first to consult with the men who presided over him; and he held this to be the duty of every man holding high ecclesiastical offices. 'But,' he said, 'do not all so understand it?' 'It appears not,' he answered; 'for there is at least one of the Apostles and one of the Presidents of the Seventies that take a different view of it; that is, judging by their actions.'"

The gentlemen referred to in the closing sentence of the President's remarks were Moses Thatcher, the Democratic nominee for the United States Senate, and B. H. Roberts, the nominee of the same party for Congress.

President Wilford Woodruff subsequently, indorsing the words of President Smith, said:

"When the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-Day Saints was organized, it was with the holy priesthood in its various orders and forms. And when a man was appointed to the Apostleship or Presidency, or in any office as a teacher of the people, it placed him in a very grave responsibility. And no man was counted at liberty, from the organization of the Church, to engage in any branch of business, politics, or anything else to take him entirely away from his calling, business, duty, or responsibility, for a length of time, without first consulting with the Presidency of the Church or with his Quorum on its propriety, and getting permission to do so. And this order has rested against us all alike. And this has been my position for sixty years of my life, and that too without interfering with my manhood. And this course does not require a man to give up his position in the Democratic party or in the Republican. . . . Every man has his own free agency. He has the right to withdraw from his Quorum or the Church if he wishes. But while he remains in his Quorum or in the Church we think he should be subject to the same rules that we are ourselves. But that duty does not require any man to withdraw from the Democratic or Republican party or give up his political principles."

President Smith's apparently innocent and very proper admonitions were seized by the Democratic leaders as an opportunity for raising a hue-and-cry against "Church interference." His own explanation was brushed aside as insincere; his words misconstrued, perverted, and misquoted. The Mormon Church, the Democrats asserted, "was in the saddle," a "crisis" had arisen, and the people were called upon to resist an attempt of the Church to dominate politics. The wildest vagaries were indulged. Ridiculous as this "tempest in a tea-pot"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now seems, it raged for days. Chairman Powers, at its inception, declared himself as follows:

"We shall meet the occasion, I trust, like men. If we find that our efforts are to be thwarted, our money wasted, our victory surreptitiously taken from us, I shall advise the State Committee to give me authority to call a convention of the Democrats of Utah, giving that convention power to consider the propriety of taking the Democratic ticket from the field, to disband the Democratic party, and to advise the voters of Utah to vote down the Constitution and to vote in favor of a Territorial form of government until we are certain that all our people, from the highest to the lowest, will be free to act politically as their judgments and their consciences dictate. I make no threat,—but this course will be pursued if occasion requires."

The State Executive Committee was convened, a State convention was called, and the flames of prejudice were vigorously fanned. Reports were published of a Mormon bishop in Logan, Utah, who had publicly advised his congregation to vote the Republican ticket. A Mormon apostle was charged with having travelled from place to place in the southern part of the Territory, stating it to be the wish of the Mormon Presidency that the Republican nominee for Congress should be elected. President Smith was accused of circulating a letter among the bishops of the Mormon Church, certifying to the good standing in the Church of this same Republican candidate. Every one of these reports was subsequently, when investigated, proved to be a political canard without a shadow of truth; and no effort has been made by their authors to substantiate them. But they were made to do duty in inflaming the minds of the people, and in giving color to the charge that the Church had resumed an active interest in State affairs. The State convention assembled, an address to the people was prepared, fiery speeches were delivered, and the following resolutions were introduced:

"*Resolved:* That the Democratic party retire its ticket from the field. That it disband and work against the admission of Utah as a State. That all parts of the address in conflict with this resolution be stricken out."

After debating these resolutions for several hours they were put to a vote and overwhelmingly defeated. Not one in a hundred delegates voted for them. Nevertheless an appeal was made to the people against "Church interference." Having set up a straw man, the Convention very promptly, but with mock display of heroism, knocked it down. The only result was to alarm the country outside Utah, not familiar with existing conditions, by giving the impression that the old anti-Mormon conflict had been reopened through the pernicious activity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Church in politics. If, perchance, sufficient sentiment should be evoked through the nation to give the President an excuse for withholding his proclamation admitting the new State, a host of Federal officials in Utah would not feel deeply aggrieved.

That both parties have sought to appeal to the religious prejudices of the Mormon people for partisan ends, cannot be denied. That high ecclesiastics have been nominated to office for the purpose of influencing their congregations, must be admitted. But that the Mormon Church has been a party to such attempts; that any pressure has been brought to bear to control politics for Church purposes, there is not a scintilla of evidence to prove. On the contrary, nothing has been more conclusive of the sincerity of the Mormon people than their refusal to be led by designing partisans through appeal to religious prejudice. Unintentionally, and contrary to the designs of those who inaugurated it, the recent scare has called attention to the pernicious practice of selecting high Church officials as political leaders. The effect that would be produced were either of the national parties to put into nomination large numbers of Catholic prelates for public office in any part of the United States can easily be understood. The discord which such action would create is sure to follow the perpetuation of a similar policy in Utah. For the good of the Church as well as for the good of the State, the Mormon Presidency must sooner or later insist that before any Church official accept a political nomination he shall doff his sacerdotal robes.

In order to get an expression of opinion on this important matter for the use of THE FORUM, I addressed a note to the Mormon Presidency, and received the following answer:

SALT LAKE CITY, October 29, 1895.

You ask us, "Do you consider it expedient, either from the standpoint of the State or the Church, for high Church officials to accept nominations for public office in Utah?"

This question came up for consideration at a meeting of the officers of the Church held in October, 1893, and we expressed ourselves to the effect that, under the circumstances which then surrounded us, it was inexpedient for the leading officers of the Church to accept nominations for public office in the Territory. We thought it probable that both parties might desire to make such nominations with the hope that in doing so they could catch votes, and that as we were then situated it would be better for leading men to decline the acceptance of political nominations, it being soon after the division on party lines. In taking this stand, however, we did not do so because we thought there was an incongruity in such men holding office; for many men who hold ecclesiastical positions are the most practical men in the community, and have had the greatest experience in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

laying of the foundation and the building up of the commonwealth, and are fully qualified, therefore, to fill with dignity the various offices in the gift of the people.

Your second question is, "Can Church officials accepting political nominations disassociate themselves in the eyes of their congregations from their religious authority?"

We may not have a clear understanding of the purport of this question, but we will answer it from one standpoint.

There may be cases at the present time of individual voters who would be influenced by religious authority in voting for men holding high positions in the Church who are nominated for office; but we have the best of reasons for believing that such instances even now will be very rare, and that it will not be long before the people will become so educated in politics that a man's Church office will not influence them in his favor, if he do not belong to their party.

As a proof of this we have only to refer to the case of Anthon H. Lund, one of the Twelve Apostles, and a man of the most estimable character, who was beaten for office in his own county and by the votes of his own people; and that, too, right at the announcement of the division on party lines. Another instance, still more recent, is the case of Heber J. Grant, also one of the Twelve Apostles, whose opponent (a non-Mormon) was elected to the Constitutional Convention, Apostle Grant running behind his ticket; whereas, if the Mormons of his precinct had voted for him, he would have been elected without question.

WILFORD WOODRUFF,
GEORGE Q. CANNON,
JOSEPH F. SMITH.

The adoption of the State Constitution by so large a majority of votes is significant proof that the people of this Territory do not believe the Church is re-entering the domain of politics. Such opposition as manifested itself to the Constitution came to no appreciable extent from those who feared Mormon rule, but from large property-owners who realized that the withdrawal of Federal support meant increased taxes; and from opponents of woman-suffrage who took this method of signifying their dislike to the clause extending the elective franchise to women. Utah has the wealth, the population, the intelligence, and resources for self-support, to entitle her to a position in the sisterhood of States. It would indeed be a calamity if the false alarm of "Church interference," raised for partisan purposes, should delay her admission into the Union.

GLEN MILLER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LITERARY HACK AND HIS CRITICS.

THE "Confessions" that I contributed to the July number of THE FORUM[1] attracted a deal of attention and excited an interest for which I was not at all prepared. There has been much curiosity expressed as to the identity of the writer, and this curiosity has quite naturally resulted in many guesses. It has been amusing how wide these guesses have been of the mark, and more amusing still that several tolerably well-known writers have rather encouraged the idea that they should be included among those suspected; and one man, only the week before this writing, while denying that he was the "Hack," practically admitted it. I shall look out for this gentleman with the confident expectation of finding him before long publishing as his own the work of someone else. He may feel, however, quite safe in claiming the authorship of these much discussed Confessions, as the real author here gives notice that he has no notion whatever of announcing his name.

I do not believe that the general public—that is, the reading public, for which hacks and others write,—misunderstood either the meaning or the purpose of my article; indeed I am persuaded that this was not the case, for I have received many letters from members of that public showing both comprehension and appreciation. But whenever the article has been noticed in print,—or in conversation within my hearing,—by professional writers, it has been criticised with some degree of severity. Singularly enough these criticisms have all been based upon a misapprehension of my meaning and purpose, neither of which the general public appears to have misunderstood. This shows, I take it, that an article which may satisfy the general reader for whom it is written may fail completely to meet the requirements of other writers who apply perhaps a different standard of criticism. Or in this case it may be that professional writers found an inner, an esoteric meaning hidden from the generality of readers. I hardly think that such is the case, though to be convinced that it is not makes it necessary to acknowledge that my Confessions were unskilfully written, that the article was unworkmanlike. I do not in the least mind admitting this,

[1] "Confessions of a Literary Hack," THE FORUM, July, 1895.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as there was in the writing no further effort than to make a plain narrative of facts, without embellishment or ornamentation. In re-reading the Confessions I must say that there is not a thing in them that I care to unsay, not a word that I wish to take back.

This is the paragraph which appears quite generally to have offended the professional writers:

"Hack writing is the most unprofitable of all employments, and, in some respects, the most undignified. It is unprofitable because the work cannot possibly bring either fame or fortune; it is undignified because the hack writer does not say what he thinks or what he feels, but says, as nearly as he can, what he thinks the editor would be pleased to have him say. In other words, the hack writer is very much of a fraud, and in moments of frank introspection he sees this very plainly, and so at times he regards himself with appropriate disrespect. Mr. Havelock Ellis, in his discussion of criminals, says that these unfortunates are the vainest creatures in the world save literary men and artists. When a hack writer persuades himself that he is a literary artist—and there are such in plenty—he saves himself from the sufferings of self-reproach."

I have been accused in the above remarks of having belittled my profession and of having cast obloquy upon the employment by which I live. I cannot see that this is so, for I have done nothing more than to tell the plain truth in plain words, and to show that I do not take myself and my work with owl-like seriousness. Besides, hack writing is not an acknowledged profession which commands universal respect, as the law, medicine, and theology do. Hack writers are merely job workers who are paid by the piece like mill-hands and itinerant scissors-grinders. It is true that now and again a hack writer is asked by an editor or publisher to write some article; but in nineteen cases out of twenty the hack writer suggests the article he would like to write, and then he peddles the idea around from office to office until he finds an appreciative understanding or a sympathetic ear. If a lawyer should go out in the highways in search of clients, he would be called a pettifogger, and the other members of his profession would look upon him with suspicion; if a physician proposed to treat all the sick people he heard of, he would be called a charlatan, and the other doctors would send him to Coventry. But the literary hack who should wait for his work to come to him would surely starve. At least this would be the case with me, and many of my critics have said that I had been unusually successful both in the returns from my work and in the periodicals to which I have sold my stories, articles, and poems.

And this brings me to another phase of the criticism. Not a person has written of my modest Confessions without speaking of the amount

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of remuneration, as though that were the most important element contributing either to success or failure. I must say that until I read what was provoked by my Confessions I had always thought $5,000 a year for a man whose business required that he should live in New York was a very small, I might say an inadequate, income. On such an income a man cannot live in a house in a pleasant quarter of the town; he cannot supply his family with more than the necessities of life; he and his wife and children must forego all the pleasures which cost anything to obtain. And yet such a man is told that he has succeeded in his life-work, and that his exposition of his income and the sources of it will encourage very many others to go into a profession which holds out such brilliant prospects. Any young person whose ambition would be satisfied by achieving what I have accomplished had as well go into hack writing as into anything else; for failure would be his portion whatever his walk of life.

Mr. Edward S. Martin, himself an amiable and accomplished hack writer, thinks that the element of uncertainty makes the life of a hack charming. In "Harper's Weekly" he writes of the hack:

> "He has to work, to be sure, but that saves him the trouble of playing, and playing is an expense. Other men, some of them, are driven to poker or to horse races or to stock speculations for excitement, but the hack needs none of those spices. Every day with him brings its own sufficient gamble. He may sell; he may not: in either case he has his emotions. There is always with him too the possibility that some time he may write something really good. Hope springs undying in the hack's bosom. His hand is always in the intellectual grab-bag, and how can he help believing that some day he will pull out a real prize; some day when the wind is right, and he has had the right things for breakfast, and has had his intellectuals or his sympathies stirred by some violent emotion, he may say something that really needs saying, and say it as it ought to be said. That possibility helps very much to keep the hack agoing, and indeed it is a very poor hack who does not realize it now and then in sufficient measure to refresh his spirit."

That is the kind of thing I said to myself when I was young and verdant, but delusive hopes do not survive the wrinkles of middle age. As explained in my article, to which this is supplementary, my hopes of my comedy helped me to get through the worst two years of my life. But youth probably would have saved me even though I had written no comedy. Gambling is not attractive to some calm natures, and for this reason, together with the others just indicated, I am persuaded that Mr. Martin has failed to throw upon the career of a hack a light that makes it appear any more rosy than it has seemed to me. And I am an older though not a better hack writer than he.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And Mr. Andrew Lang, hack of hacks, falls afoul of me in the columns of the "Illustrated London News." If anyone had desired to see how an accomplished hack can grind a newspaper column out of nothing he need go no further than this article by Mr. Lang, who has time and again confessed himself to be a hack, and who in this very article says: "I would rather be a hack than a Q. C." Mr. Lang places me between Ned Purdon—

> "He long was a bookseller's hack;
> He lived such a damnable life in this world,
> That I don't think he 'll wish to come back."

—and Mr. Arthur Pendennis, who was in society, kept a horse, and could afford to drink porter from the pewter. Whether closer to the one or the other he does not say, but he is sure that I am deserving of no good thing in this world because I confess to having contributed short stories to the American magazines. These short stories in the American magazines Mr. Lang finds so uniformly bad that they are to his taste all alike. He probably thought the hack of whom he was writing was Mr. ——; no, never mind; it is as well that I should not in this instance say what is in my mind. Really, however, Mr. Lang had nothing of importance to say about hack writing, so he summarized my article rather unfairly and so filled the column which is his to fill every week. And probably he blessed the brother hack who gave him ready to hand the subject on which to write without the bother or expense of a single thought.

The newspaper writers who took issue with my statements did so as a general thing upon the ground that other professional men received no greater compensation than I receive. I grant that this is so in the smaller cities. But if I lived in a smaller city I could not make half what I make in New York. In New York it must be borne in mind that it takes two dollars to do what one dollar will do in the smaller cities and towns. I have a classmate who lives in Philadelphia. He is a bank cashier with a salary of $4,500. He has his own house and keeps it up in decent style; I am obliged to live on the fifth floor of an apartment house with no elevator. Yet I do not believe that he is a better manager of his means than I am of mine. The men who think an income of $5,000 a year in New York, to a man with a family to support, is a generous competency, probably have so different a standard by which to measure things from that used by me that it is unprofitable to discuss such a question with them. Such men also do not seem to be able to understand that my grievance, if such it must be called, is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not because of my small income, but of my small influence and of the scant consideration with which I am treated by those with whom I have to deal. The advertising canvasser is really a person of more consequence to the publisher of a periodical than the most original writer on his staff; and, as against a "hustling" solicitor for "write-up" advertisements, the merely casual literary hack weighs not at all. He is considered to possess nothing for which these publishers need have any respect,—neither taste, moral scruples, political views, nor religious convictions; but his pen is expected ever to be ready at a penny a word to do his master's bidding in his master's way. A literary hack who is proud of his calling would be very apt to think well of himself in the humblest occupation open to man,—sweeping the streets, for instance, or breaking stones on the roadside with an armed guard looking on.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED